NON-MUSLIMS
UNDER MUSLIM RULE
AND
MUSLIMS
UNDER NON-MUSLIM RULE

DR. AMIR HASAN SIDDIQI

Former Head of Islamic History
UNIVERSITY OF KARACHI

Published by :
JAMIYATUL FALAH KARACHI

THE AUTHOR -

Born in 1909 at Badaun (U. P.) Dr. Amir Hasan Siddiqi obtained his B.A. and LL.B. Degrees from the Muslim University of Aligarh. In 1928 he went to England for higher studies and obtained B. A. (Hons.) and Ph. D. from the University of London. There he wrote his doctoral thesis entitled *Caliphate and Sultanate in Medieval Persia* under Professor H.A.R. Gibb. The thesis was subsequently published and was hailed by the famous Orientalist, Sir E. Denison Ross, as *an excellent piece af original research.*

On his return from London, Dr. Siddiqi worked as senior lecturer in Islamic History, Muslim University, Aligarh (1935-43), founder-principal of Sind Muslim College, Karachi (1943-47), and founder principal of Islamia College, Karachi (1948-50). In 1953 he took charge as the Head of the Department of Islamic History at the newly established University of Karachi.

Dr. Siddiqi has contributed a good deal to the literature on Islamic History. His interest has mainly centred round the development of Muslim political institutions. In 1959 he visited Australian universities under a programme jointly sponsored by the Spalding Trust, Oxford, and the Government of Pakistan. These lectures were published in book form in 1960 under the title: *Studies in Islamic History.*

Dr. Siddiqi is also the author of another thought-provoking work : *Islamic State: A Historical Survey,* which makes a masterly presentation of the historical evolution and working of the Islamic State from the time of the Holy Prophet down to 1258 A.C.

In 1962 Dr. Siddiqi contributed a series of articles on the evolution of Muslim institutions from the advent of the Holy Prophet (peace be upon him) down to the age of the Abbasids. These scholarly articles have been published in the form of a book entitled : *The Origins and Development of Muslim Institutions.*

In 1963 Dr. Siddiqi brought out the revised edition of his doctoral thesis entitled 'Caliphate and Sultanate in Medieval Persia' to which he added three more chapters on the Theory and Practice of the Caliphate.

In 1964 Dr. Siddiqi went to the Phillipplnes as the Visiting Professor, under a programme sponsored by the SEATO, to deliver a series of lectures on Islam, its history and culture, at the newly established Mindanao State University for the benefit of the Muslims who happened to be in majority in that area.

During the last three years Dr. Siddiqi brought out two volumes of "Heroes of Islam", giving life sketches of twelve Muslim rulers who ruled in accordance with the Shariat Law, and one book entitled 'Muslim Generals' giving their lives and achievements.

The third edition of his doctoral thesis has come out this year (1969). The present book "Non-Muslims under Muslim Rule and Muslims under non-Muslims Rule", is the first exhaustive book on this subject.

Non-Muslims Under Muslim Rule

AND

Muslims Under Non-Muslim Rule

Seminar Library
Department of Islamic History
University of Karachi.

Koha

Dr. Amir Hasan Siddiqi

The Jamiyatul Falah Publications,
A. M. 20 Off Frere Road,
KARACHI-3.

Price Rs. 7/-

743
Acc

Seminar Library
Department of History
University of [illegible]

Dedicated to

my revered leader,

MR. HUSAIN IMAM,

as a token of regard and affection for him;
for his role in the creation of Pakistan, and
devotion to Islam.

A. H. Siddiqi

Seminar Library
Department of Islamic History
University of Karachi.

PREFACE

The real nature of Islam comes out in history. It is here that principles are worked out in practice and the results are there for anyone to see. The conduct of a people is determined by its norms inculcated by the religion they profess. Hence history is a reflex of the beliefs they hold.

An important aspect of a polity is the pattern of human relations it engenders both among its own members and with others. This entails the baffling question of treatment accorded to subject people which has been a questiona vexata from times immemorial. In our own times the question has been a most explosive one, generating one conflagration after another. This is because of lack of that sense of justice which constitutes the spirit of Islam and makes us extend fair treatment to one and all, irrespective of whether a person belongs to our faith, race, country and community or not. The walls separating man from man must fall and bring them closer together as human beings. The Muslims hold it as an article of faith that the overriding consideration is humanity, and professing a different faith, howsoever hostile, or belonging to another group, should prove no bar to the exercise of the ethics of humanity. Enjoined by the Quran not to exercise complusion in matters of religion and treat others on a differential basis, the Muslims have persistently, in all times and all climes, regarded subject people as a sacred trust and meted out a fair treatment to them, even if it proved at times detrimental to their own interests, and even harmful or disastrous to them. This has been happening again and again, reaching a climax with the redoubtable Salahuddin Ayyubi, an exemplar of chivalry and humanity. In countries like Spain and the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent it has actually spelt their downfall. In the latter country, particularly they are still face to face with the consequences of their ultra-liberal attitude.

It is particularly worth noting that for centuries when Christians were ruthlessly persecuting fellow-Christians and reached the lowest rung of morality, the Muslims set up a brilliant record of benevolent treatment to those who were not their co-religionists and extremely ill disposed towards them. Consistent with their attitude and their religion, they have meted out an equally generous treatment to their subjects even in modern times and have, in return, met with a shabby treatment which puts the worst atrocities of humanity in the shade.

Such noble behaviour throughout history is well worth study and elucidation so that they who generally think and speak uncharitably of Islam and its followers should know how things really stand and how clean have been the hands of the Muslims in this regard.

On the other hand, as a study in contrast, it is also well worth studying how others have been treating Muslims, returning a bad coin for every good coin that the Muslims have been giving to them. These complementary studies will, it is hoped, give a complete picture of the matter under consideration and perhaps produce a sense of reason in those who still persist in victimising Muslims wherever they happen to be under their thumb.

Amir Hasan Siddiqi

Jamiyatul Falah,
Karachi.
3rd May, 1969.

CONTENTS

Pages

Preface ... i

Part I

Non-Muslims under Muslim Rule

1. The position of Non-Muslims in Islamic State ... 1
2. Non-Muslims under the Pious Caliphate 10
3. Non-Muslims under the Umayyads (Damascus) ... 19
4. Non-Muslims under the Umayyads of Spain ... 26
5. Non-Muslims under the Abbasids 32
6. Non-Muslims under the Muslim Rulers of India ... 41
7. Non-Muslims under Turkish Sultans 55

Part II

Muslims under Non-Muslim Rule

1. Muslims in Spain 63
2. Muslims in China 71
3. Muslims in Russia 86
4. Muslims in Ethiopia 102
5. Muslims in Philippines 112
6. Muslims India 125
7. Muslims in Kashmir 143
8. Muslims in Palestine 158

PART I

Non-Muslims Under Muslim Rule

Non-Muslims Under Muslim Rule

The position of Non-Muslims in Islamic State :

In order to understand the position of non-Muslims in an Islamic state, it is essential to understand the nature of such a state itself. The fundamental difference between Islamic and other states is that in the former sovereignty belongs to Almighty God while in other states it essentially belongs to human beings. This does not, however, mean that in an Islamic state all the laws are framed by God Himself or that the Holy Book of Islam provides all positive laws. There are, however, certain commandments, prohibitions and guiding principles which have been explicitly laid down in the Quran e.g. regarding matrimonial relations, inheritance, etc., and they have to be incorporated in Muslim legal codes without any alteration. As for legislation on questions in respect of which Islam is silent, it has been left at the discretion of the legislative organ of the Islamic state. This legislation, however, must never conflict with the fundamentals of Islam as laid down in the Quran and the Sunnah. Thus we can conclude that in an Islamic state human beings have limited rights of sovereignty, while in all other states they arrogate to themselves unlimited sovereign rights.

It would be a fallacy to compare the Islamic state with any of the modern states as it occupies a unique position and stands as a class by itself. Since it recognizes only the sovereignty of God and does not believe in unrestricted man-made laws its object is to put an end to the rule of human beings over other beings. Moreover, since Islam embraces the totality of human life, Islamic state inherently refuses to recognize compartmentalization of life into spiritual and temporal sectors. In addition, although it is a religious state, it is totally different from theocracy as understood in the

Christian tradition where a certain section of religious people had arrogated to itself, in the name of religion, absolute powers over and against the rest of the people. On the contrary in an Islamic state even the head of the state is not a law-giver, he is merely an executor of Divine law.

Since the Islamic state is basically an ideological state, only those persons are to be primarily entrusted with its administration who believe in its ideology, are conversant with its spirit, and have dedicated themselves to the promotion of the objectives of the state. And since Islam is the basic ideology of the state, it is Muslims alone who can be genuinely expected to dedicate themselves fully to running such a state and undergoing all sacrifices that might come in the way of keeping that state a going concern. This does not mean that the Islamic State taboos the utilization of non-Muslims in the service of the state. This only means that while availing of the services of non-Muslims, due care should be taken that the Islamic character of the state is not compromised and the ideological demands are not sacrified at the altar of so called "tolerance". This is possible only if the basic policy-making positions are held by those who are deeply and whole-heartedly committed to Islam. In this respect the Islamic state may be regarded as having something in common with the Communist state, but the cruel treatment meted out by the Communist Party to non-Communists is conspicuous only for its absence in Islamic societies. For Islam does not believe in forcing others to embrace its religion, culture and traditions, nor does it believe in employing hypocritical nationalist slogans with a view to destroying the distinct cultural and religious identity of non-Muslim communities living in lands under Muslim dominance.

In accordance with the verse of the Quran: "It is He who hath created you; and of you are some that are disbelievers and some that are believers" (LXIV: 2), the subjects of an Islamic state are classified into these two categories. The disbelievers are those who do not believe in the existence of God Almighty and in the Hereafter. The followers of this godless cult are fundamentally opposed to all beliefs in the establishment of peace by liberating mankind from all shackles of slavery, mental or physical. It is the worst enemy of humanity who by not allowing liberty of conscience, keeps human beings under mental bondage. So long as this cult survives, Islam cannot flourish and will not be able to achieve its ideal; and, therefore, as a moral force, it is directly opposed to this evil force. Hence this godless cult has been described in the Holy Quran as mischief (fitnah) which must be rooted out from the universe so that the religion of God may flourish.

It is, however, the distinctive merit of Islam alone that it has ordered its followers to act nobly not only towards those non-Muslims with whom they might enter into a covenant but also towards those who might be at war with them. Indeed, Islam recognises and fixes up the rights of the enemies, and this it does not merely conventionally but in a very positive and emphatic form. It lays down the injunctions and threatens the violators with dire punishment.

The Holy Quran says :

> " and let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and depart from justice. Be just: that is nearer to Piety: and fear Allah. For Allah is well acquainted with all that ye do. (V. 9.)

This verse lays down the general and governing obligation of dispensing absolute and perfect justice to all non-Muslims, irrespective of their being friends or foes, covenantees or belligerents.

Elsewhere, the Holy Quran speaks especially with referenee to its blood-thirsty opponents in the following words :

"Fight in the cause of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress limits for Allah loveth not transgressors." (II. 190).

It means that even in actual fighting against those who attack the Muslims for the sole purpose of destroying Islam, strict limits of justice, humanity and goodness have got to be observed-limits which we find clearly defined in the Hadith literature. Thus for instance, the Holy Prophet Muhammad is reported to have exhorted the Muslim army in an order of the day :—

"Proceed in the Name of Allah and with His help and on the faith of the Messenger of Allah. Do not kill the very old, nor the infants, nor the minors, nor the womenfolk. Do not cheat. Do not break trust. Do not mutilate and disfigure the bodies of your dead enemies."

Another Hadith forbids the killing of monks and hermits engaged in worship in their monasteries and hermitages. This confines the permission of killing to those able-bodied enemies who actually enter the battlefield to fight.

It is related that, during a battle, the Holy Prophet found the body of a murdered woman on the battlefield. He was sorely grieved, denounced the act in emphatic terms and warned against any future recurrence. This was his attitude, although his enemies were unscrupulous and cruel even to the extent of cannibalism. The Holy Prophet has exhorted its followers to practise absolute and perfect justice with regard to all non-Muslims residing in the Islamic State, whether they are citizens or Resident Aliens. For instance, he says: "My Lord (Allah) has forbidden me from doing any injustice to a non-Muslim whether he is a Covenantee or otherwise. May be, you will have the opportunity of engaging in war with an enemy people whom you will overpower. They will enter into a treaty with you concerning their property and their offspring. Therefore, do not take anything from their possessions beyond that which has been stipulated in the treaty."

Hence it could be concluded that even in its treatment towards those who deny the very existence of God and Hereafter, Muslims have been enjoined to treat them leniently if they desist from their evil ways.

Among the 'believers' there are two kinds: firstly, those who believe in all the previous religions and their Prophets, and also in Islam as the last religion and Prophet Muhammad as the last Prophet; secondly, those who believe in their own revealed books and Prophets, but not in Islam.

In the light of the above facts, let us examine the position of those who though they believe in the existence of God and Hereafter but do not subcribe to the beliefs of Islam and thus do not adhere to the fundamentals of Islamic state. Such people are technically called protected people (dhimmis). They are those non-Muslims who live under the protection of the Islamic state, or have been forced to submit by conquest. As for defending the state, enforcing the laws of Islam, and spreading the ideology of Islam, non-Muslims have nothing to do with all these responsibilities. They only agree to live in peace and tranquility under the protection of the Islamic state. Since in this state preference is given to those even among Muslims who have rendered more services and have made greater sacrifices for its cause, it is but natural that the protected people who neither believe in its ideology nor are prepared to share equal responsibilities with the Muslims, will have different rights, privileges and duties from those enjoyed by the Muslim citizens. Consequently in this state each class of people will have its advantages and disadvantages. The Islamic state, however, guarantees to these people full security of their lives and property, free exercise of their religious rites, and in return they agree to contribute a nominal annual tax, commonly known as jizyah. This tax not only entitles them to enjoy the above rights but also to secure exemption from military service to the state, which is obligatory on every able-bodied Muslim citizen. This tax is imposed only upon those non-Muslim citizens who are incapable of rendering military service. All persons above the age of 50 and below the age of 16, women, children, religious functionaries, the poor, the destitute and the disabled are, exempted from the payment of this tax. If the protected people are willing to render military service they can be exempted from the payment of this tax.

Thus, it is open to the protected people themselves to acquire the same rights in this connection as are enjoyed by the Muslim citizens. If the Muslim authorities at any stage find themselves unable to give protection to such people, the jizyah is not to be levied upon them. The amount of jizyah varied from class to class from approximately Rs. 6 to Rs. 12 per annum.

It would be worthwhile mentioning the terms which were offered by the Holy Prophet to the members of the protected faith in return for the tax (jizyah) imposed upon them:

1. If they are attacked by an enemy, the Muslims will defend them.

2. They will not be dissuaded from their religion.
3. They will not be required to go personally to the tax collector for payment of tax (jizyah).
4. Their lives will be secure.
5. Their wealth, goods and cattle will be secure.
6. Their trading caravans will be secure.
7. Their lands will be secure.
8. All that they possessed will be secure.
9. Their religious leaders will not be removed from their positions.
10. Their crosses and churches will not be damaged.
11. Military force will not be sent to their lands.
12. They will not be asked to deviate from their religious belief.
13. None of the rights they have been enjoying will be demied.

These terms cover the whole position of the protected people under the Islamic state. Hence we can conclude that so far as responsibilities in respect of the defence of the state are concerned, the members of the protected faith are even in a more advantageous position than the Muslims themselves. While the former could be exempted from military service on payment of a nominal tax, the latter, under no circumstances, could enjoy such exemption.

In the beginning in matters of taxation from land there was, however, some discrimination between the two classes of people. Muslims were charged only 1/80 of the produces from the land which was in their possession while the non-Muslims land-holders were charged khiraj which amounted from 1/5 to 1/2 of the produce. Here too the concession granted to the Muslims was nullified later on when Muslims were not allowed to have possession of the conquered land but were also debarred from acquiring it from the hands of non-Muslims.

It was not obligatory on any non-Muslim to cultivate land as it was a purely contractual offair between the non-Muslims and the state. However, they were granteed full proprietary, permanent and inalienable rights on their lands. Their lands could not be purchased by the Muslims who were debarred from acquiring it. Even the government could not acquire such land for state puposes without the consent of the owner. The original Muslim land-owners were charged only ushr, i.e. one tenth of the produce. They were, however, very few. Moreover, the ushr had to be charged on every crop that could be grown during the course of the years, and in no circumstances could it be remitted. Besides the Muslims had to pay an additional tax known as Zakat which amounted to two and a half per cent on the accumulated income of every Muslim citizen at the end of the year. The non-Muslims were exempted both from military service and payment of this tax.

Social and Cultural Autonomy :

Perhaps the most striking feature of Islam, in respect of its attitude towards the non-Muslims, is the award of social and judicial autonomy. In a lengthy passage of the Quran, we read.

> "If then they have recourse unto thee (O Muhammad), judge between them or disclaim jurisdiction. Then they cannot harm thee at all; but if thou judgest, judge between them with equity. Lo! God loveth the equitable. Let the people of the Gospel judge not by that which God hath revealed: such are evil lives. And unto thee (to Muhammad) have We revealed the Scripture with the truth, confirming whatever Scripture was before it, and watch over it: so judge between them by that which God hath revealed, and follow not their desires away from the truth which hath come to thee; for we have appointed a Divine law (Shariah) and traced out away Had God willed He could have made you one community, but He may try you by that which He hath given you; so vie one with another in good works; unto God ye will all return, and he will then inform you of that wherein ye differ."
>
> (Quran v: 42-48)

It is on the basis of this commandment that the Prophet and his successors in Islam have granted judicial autonomy to every non-Muslim commmunty from among the subjects of the Islamic state.

In the time of the Orthodox Caliphs, for instance, we find contemporary Christian sources attesting that the Muslim government had abandoned, in favour of Christian priests, a good deal of temporal judicial jurisdiction.

In the time of the Prophet, the Jews of Madina had their Bait al Midnas (an educational institute). In the treaty with the Christains of Najran, the Prophet had given a guarantee not only for the security of the person and property of the inhabitants, but had also expressly left the nomination of bishops and priests to the Christian community itself.

If a Muslim murdered a non-Muslim, he was to be handed over to the successors of the latter for retaliation. The civil cases of the non-Muslims were decided according to their own law, and by their own courts. These courts were exclusively ecclesiastcal. The heads of the Churches acted as judges. Their jurisdiction extended not merely to marriage and inheritance but also to most of the disputes. The non-Muslims, in addition to that, were allowed to seek justice in a Muslim court if they so desired. But once they had submitted their case to a Muslim court, they were not allowed to withdraw it. Muslim authorities were not allowed to interfere with the personal laws. e. g. laws of inheritance of the non-Muslims. No Christian or Jew could inherit from a Muslim, and no Muslim from a Christian or Jew. This meant that the children of non-Muslims, if they embraced Islam, had to be disinherited. If a non-Muslim left a will for the construction of his own place of worship it was allowed. The goods of an heirless protected subject were to devolve upon the members of his own community, while those of an heirless Muslim were to go to the Central Treasury of the Government.

As stated above, since the non-Muslims did not believe in the Islamic ideology they could not be given any key position in the administration of the government; and they had also to be excluded from all such posts which involved the performance of religious duties. But later on, with the multiplicity of offices and separation of various departments, they got more than their due share in government service. In such lucrative occupations as banking, large commercial ventures, linen trade, land ownership, medical profession etc., the Christians and Jews were well represented and firmly established.

In fact, in safeguarding the rights of non-Muslims in an Islamic state, Islam has gone to such extremes as to give them the liberty of maintaining even those practices which are entirely opposed to the teaching of Islam. For instance, the consumption of intoxicants is forbidden to Muslims, yet the non-Muslim inhabitants of the country have full liberty, not only of consumption but also of manufacture, import, and sale. The same is true of games of chance and contracts entailing usury.

Muslim tradition insists strongly that the non-Muslims are to be treated kindly. The Prophet said: "If anyone wrongs a man to whom a treaty has been granted or burdens him above his strength, I will advocate against him on the day of judgement."

Non-Muslims under the Pious Caliphate

In the previous chapter we dealt with the theoretical position of the Non-Muslims in an Islamic State and the treatment meted out to them by the Prophet of Islam as both the theoretical position and the practice of the Prophet were identical. In the present one, we would like to deal with the actual position of the Non-Muslim subjects under the Pious Caliphate. The immediate successors of the Prophet of Islam being strict followers of the Quranic injunctions and the practice of the Prophet, the treatment meted out to the Non-Muslims under their regime will not vary much from that which has been described before.

It would be absurd to try to compare the rights granted by the immediate successors of the Prophet of Islam to *Dhimmis* (non-Muslim subjects of the Muslim State) with those granted by other Imperal States of the day to their subjects of alien races. Their neighbours were the Eastern Roman Empire and the Persian Empire, and in both of them the status of alien subjects was worse than that of slaves. The Syrian Christians though co-religionists of their Roman rulers, had no proprietary rights in the lands they tilled. On the contrary they were themselves treated as a kind of property for when an estate was sold by one owner to another, the cultivators were conveyed along with their land, and the new owner had the same rights over them as the old one. The condition of the Jews was worse, and was indeed so bad that they could hardly be called subjects, for the subjects of a State do have some rights after all, whereas the Jews had none; Christians were in the same plight in Persia.

However, in order to understand the true position of *Dhimmis* during this regime, one must bear in mind that the Caliphate was an ideological State, and as such only those persons could be entrusted with its administration who had firm belief in its ideology and were conversant with its spirit and had made the realization of the aim of that State their life mission. It were the believers alone who had made all kinds of sacrifices and had undertaken to bear all the responsibilities of running the State; and the *Dhimmis* had agreed only to live with peace and tranquility within its jurisdiction. Naturally, the rights and responsibilities of each section of the people differed fundamentally. Since the *Dhimmis* did not believe in its ideology, they could not possibly be associated with its basic administration and also could not be entrusted with any key position. However the Caliphate, in accordance with the verse of the Quran : "No compulsion in matters of faith" did not believe in forcing its religion, culture and traditions on others or adopting coercive measures under the cloak of nationalism for merging the culture of the *Dhimmis* into that of Muslims. On the other hand, it provided full scope for the growth of their culture and the administration of their civil affairs in accordance with their own religious laws.

As the *Dhimmis* were not obliged to defend the State, they were required to pay a small tax in the form of Jizia but the moment they showed their willingness to render military service, they were to be exempted from the payment of this tax. That the Jizia was charged in lieu of military service can be proved by the fact that only those persons were charged this tax who were capable of rendering military service; women, old persons, children, the sick and disabled were all exempt from its payment. Even the religious leaders of other faiths who had retired from life enjoyed this exemption. Hazrat Umar had also laid down this rule that if a *Dhimmi* rendered military service even once in a year, he was to be exempted from Jizia. On the other hand, no exemption from rendering military service was possible for any Muslim at any cost. By paying this tax the non-Muslims enjoyed double benefit i.e. exemption from military service and the guarantee given to them by the State for the protection of their person, property, religious rites and honour. If at any time, the Muslims were not in a position to give such protection to their non-Muslim subjects, the Jizia was not to be charged and if charged was to be returned. It is a historical fact that when owing to the imminent and hazardous battle of Yarmuk, the Muslim army had to withdraw from the western districts of Syria and thought they could no longer bear the responsibility for the protection of the inhabitants of the cities of Hims, Damascus and others, from whom the Muslims had already received the Jizia, they returned the whole amount so collected to the inhabitants and said that as they could no longer take the responsibility for their protection, they had no right to the tax. Another decisive evidence that Jizia was the price of protection is afforded by the fact that when military service was received from any people, they were exempted from Jizia though they continued in their own religion. Hazrat Umar himself wrote to his army commander of Iraq in 17 A.H.: 'Take what service you want from mounted soldiers and exempt them from Jizia." If any people participated in the wars of the Muslims even once, their Jizia for that year was remitted. When Adharbaijan was conquered in 22 A. H. the inhabitants of the city were given the guarantee that the people who would serve in the army in any one year would be exempted from Jizia for that year. The treaty concluded with Shahrbaraz, the ruler of Armenia, in the same year included the following terms:

"The people of Armenia are bound to take part in every military expedition and comply with every order issued by the governor on the condition that they shall pay no Jizia".

Jurjan was conquered the same year, and the Farman granted to them contained the following words "We are responsible for your protection on the condition that you shall pay Jizia every year according to your means, but if we take military service from you, the Jizia will be remitted to you in return for the same".

In order to lighten the burden of the poor classes, Hazrat Umar, instead of charging one *dinar* from each and every able-bodied individual made it a graded tax. In consequence of this modification, the rich were charged 48 dirhams a year, the middle class people 24 *dirhams* and the poor class 12 dirhams per annum.

Qadi Abu Yusuf relates in Kitab u'l Kharaj, in the Chapter on Jizia; that when Umar was returning from Syria, he saw at a place a number of men standing in the sun and oil being poured on their heads. He inquired what the proceedings meant and was told that they had not paid their Jizia and were being punished for the default. The Caliph asked what was their plea for their failure to pay the tax, and they replied 'poverty'. "Let them go", ordered the Caliph, "and do not torment them, for I have heard the Apostle of Allah say: "Do not torture people, for those who torture their fellows will be tortured on the Day of Judgement".

Dhimmis were required to pay no other taxes than Jizia and custom duties. On the other hand, Muslims had to pay Zakat which was heavier than Jizia. The stipends which the Muslim reserves received from the public teasury were also shared by the *Dhimmis*. One particular regulation clinches the matter. A Muslim who became an invalid or was too old to earn his living received maintenance allowance from the state treasury. Similar or rather more generous treatment was meted out to the *Dhimmis*. The rule had been made during the Caliphate of Hazrat Abu Bakr. The terms granted by Khalid b. Walid on the conquest of Hira contained the following :-

" I have granted them the right that when a man becomes unfit to work because of old age or is visited by some calamity or misfortune or having been wealthy he becomes poor, so that he becomes exempt from Jizia, he and his family will receive maintenance allowance from the public treasury as long as he resides in the Muslim country."

The same rule continued in the reign of Hazrat Umar, an'd what is more, he fortified it further by basing it on a verse of the Holy Quran and wrote to his treasury officer that in the Quranic injunction 'Charities were for the poor and the needy'; 'poor' meant the Muslim poor and 'the needy' meant the poor among the Jews and the Christians. It is related in this connection that Hazrat Umar once saw an old man begging and asked him why he was doing so. The old man replied that Jizia had been imposed upon him whereas he could not afford it. Hazrat Umar took him home, gave him some cash and sent him to the treasury officer with the word that such old people who could not earn their living should be supported from the public treasury, adding with reference to the Quranic injunction quoted above: "By God, it is not just that we should benefit from the youth of the people and turn them out to beg in the streets in their old age."

Before Hazrat Umar's reign there were substantial differences between the tax derived from Muslim and non-Muslim land-owners. While the former used to pay Ushr i. e. one-tenth of the produce and the latter had to pay Kharaj i.e. from 1/5th to 1/2 of the produce. With the advent of Hazrat Umar this distinction disappeared.

Before Hazrat Umar, it was the practice that all the conquered lands from the non-Muslims were regarded as booty and as such used to be distributed among the Muslim warriors. But Hazrat Umar decided in an historic Majlis-i-Shura of the Companions of the Prophet that since in accordance with a verse of the Quran, future generations of the Muslims had also some interest in these lands, they should not be distributed among the present generation of the Muslim warriors; but the entire conquered lands should be left in the possession of the original non-Muslim owners and the Kharaj realized from them should be devoted to giving fixed annuities to the soldiers and their dependants. This system had two-fold advantage. Firstly, by making the soldiers self-supporting they were made ready for Jihad at a moment's notice; secondly, by allowing the lands in possession of the original cultivators who were well versed in the method of cultivation, the yield continued to increase and the tillers of the soil became prosperous and were thus given sufficient incentive to grow more and more food. In this way, the State became self-sufficient in food and the creation of a standing military force became possible. In no case Muslims were allowed to purchase such land from the non-Muslims. Even the State could not require it for its own purposes without the consent of the owner. The revenue fixed by the State was based on equitable methods and in no case exceeded half the produce of the land if taken in kind. The Caliph Umar had issued instructions to the rent-collectors that they should deal with the non-Muslim cultivators leniently.

The land revenue assessments on *Dhimmis* were very light. Still H. Umar was ever anxious about their sufferings and hardship and thought of them even on his death-bed. It was his custom to invite every year, when the collections from Iraq arrived at Madinah, ten men from Kufah and ten from Basrah and made them swear four times that no hardship had been inflicted on the people in making the collections. Two or three days before his death, H. Umar sent for the settlement officers, talked with them about the assessments and asked again and again whether the assessments were fair and not harsh.

Participation in civil administration is a very valuable privilege which a subject people can have, and H. Umar always consulted the *Dhimmis* in matters of administration concerning their welfare and took no step without obtaining their consent beforehand. When the settlement of Iraq was taken in hand, Persian landlords were invited to Madinah and consulted with regard to revenue assessments. In the settlement of Egypt the Muqauqish was usually consulted.

Below we reproduce one of the treaties entered into with the conquered peoples. They not only bear out the statement made above, but will also enable the reader to compare the rights granted by Hazrat Umar with those granted by European imperialists to their subjects in any country in spite of their claims to being civilized states.

The treaty of Jerusalem written in the presence and in the words of Hazrat Umar himself was as follows :—

"This is the protection which the servant of Allah, Umar, the Commander of Believers, has granted to the people of Ailiya. The protection is for their lives and properties, their churches and crosses, their sick and healthy, and for all their co-religionists. Their churches shall not be used for habitation, nor shall they be demolished, nor shall any injury be done to them or to their compounds or to their crosses, nor shall their properties be injured in any way. There shall be no compulsion on them in the matter of religion, nor Jews shall be made to live with them in Ailiya, The people of Ailiya undertake to pay Jizia like the inhabitants of other cities and to turn out the Romans. The life and property of a Roman who leaves the city shall be safe until he reaches a place of safety, but any Roman who makes his domicile in Ailiya shall be safe and shall pay Jizia. If any inhabitant of Ailiya wishes to go away with the Romans and takes crosses he shall be safe until he reaches a place of safety. Whatever is written herein is under the covenant of Allah and the responsibility of His Apostle of the Caliph and of the Believers in them. Witnesses to this deed are Khalid b. Walid and Amr b.

As and Abdul Rahman b. Auf and Muawiyah b. Abu Sufyan written in 15 A.H. "

The Farman makes it clear that the lives, properties and religion of the Christian subjects shall be safe from every kind of interference or molestation, and it is obvious that the rights granted to any people belong to these three categories. It is specifically undertaken that the churches shall not be demolished nor shall any injury be done to them, nor shall any encroachment be made on the areas adjoining those churches. Freedom of religion is assured by the stipulation that there shall be no compulsion on them in respect of their religion. As the Christians believe that the Jews bad killed Jesus on the Cross and the event had taken place at Jerusalem, as a concession to their religious sentiments they were assured that no Jews would be permitted to reside in their midst. Romans had fought the Muslims and were their real enemies. However,they were permitted to live in the city if they desired to do so, or go away if they so desired, but in both cases they could have the guarantee of safety for themselves, their propertses, and their churches or places of worship. Even the Christians of Jerusalem were permitted to go away and join the Romans if they desired to do so. They would not be interfered with or molested, and the churches they would leave behind in Jerusalem would be safe. A more just aud magnanimous treatment of a conquered people by conquerors cannot be cited from the annals of any other nation.

So for as the dispensation of justice was concerned, the Muslims and the non-Muslims stood on equal footing. If a non-Muslim was murdered by a Muslim, the latter was handed over to the former's successors for retaliation. Civil cases of the non-Muslims were decided in accordance with their own laws and in their own courts. These courts were exclusively ecclesiastical. The heads of the churches acted as judges. However, the non-Muslims were not debarred from seeking justice in a Muslim court. Of course, the State did not compel any *Dhimmi* to submit to the jursidiction of the Qadi if he was not so inclined. But once he submitted to his jurisdiction, the trial proceeded according to the Muslim law and he had to abide by it.

An incident which occurred during the Caliphate of Hazrat Ali will throw ample light on the sense of justice which prevailed during the Pious Caliphate. An armament lost by Hazrat Ali was found in the possession of a Jew, who, on demand refused to return it to the Caliph. Hazrat Ali was obliged to lodge a complaint before the Qadi and produced his son, Hasan, and one of his freed slaves as witnesses. But as the Qadi did not accept the evidence of his kinsmen in his favour in accordance with the legal procedure of Islam, Hazrat Ali lost the case and went away without any grudge. The Jew was, however, so much impressed by the spirit of Islamic justice that he embraced Islam.

Muslim authorities were not allowed to interfere with the laws of inheritance of the non-Muslims. No Christian or Jew could inherit from a Muslim and no Muslim from a Christian or a Jew. The Muslim State further guaranteed that protected religions did not in any way collide with each other. No Jew could become a a Christian, and vice versa If a *Dhimmi* left a will for the construction of a mosque, it was not allowd ; but if he left a will for the construction of his own worshipping place, it was allowed. The goods of an heirless protected subject were to devolve upon the members of his community, while those of a Muslim were to go to the Baitul Mal.

The Caliphate never interfered with the worship of the protected subjects. Monasticism continued in peaceful prosperity. Every community of whatever persuasion was permitted to choose its own spiritual chief. The Christians were allowed to maintain and repair their old churches and also to construct new ones. Only in those towns which were founded by the Muslims they were not allowed to construct new churches.

Treatment of *Dhimmis,* Conspiring or in Revolt

One noteworthy fact about 'Umar's Caliphate is that if the *Dhimmis* ever made any conspiracy or rose in rebellion, the usual favours were not withdrawn from them. On the border of Syria and Asia Minor was situated a city called 'Arbsus. When Syria was conqueed, this city also passed into Muslim hands, and the treaty of peace was signed, but the inhabitants of 'Arbsus maintained secret relations with the Romans and kept them informed of movements this side of the border. 'Umar b. Sa'd, the governor, reported the matter to H. 'Umar. The only punishment the Caliph awarded for their base treachery was that he wrote to 'Umair to make an inventory of all their property, lands, cattle and other chattels, purchase them at double their price and tell the people to leave the Muslim territory and go away wherever they liked. If they would not agree to it, 'Umair was to give them respite of one year ; but if they did not mend their ways even then, they were to be exiled. As they would not mend their ways, the orders at last had to be carried out.

One most eloquent proof of the favours shown to the *Dhimmis* is afforded by their own conduct towards their Muslim conquerors. The *Dhimmis* sided with the Muslims on every occasion against the governments of their own co-religionists. It was the *Dhimmis* who provided food stores for the Muslim armies, held markets in the army camps, built roads and bridges under their own supervision and at their own expense, and above all rendered espionage and intelligence services. They informed the Muslims of the secret movements and plans of the enemy, although they were their own co-religionists, Parsis or Christians. To what degree the Muslims had won the hearts of the *Dhimwis* by their kindness and generosity of treatment may be judged from the fact that when the Muslims had to withdraw from Hims to fight the battle of Yarmuk, the Jews swore on the Torah that so long as the breath of life was in them, the Romans would not enter the city, and the Christians professed with great wistfulness that the Muslims were more welcome to them than the Romans.

In conclusion we can say that Muslims tradition insists strongly that the non-Muslims were to be treated kindly or at least justly. Hazrat Abu Bakr said, "If a province or people receive you, make an agreement with them and keep your promise, take tribute from them as is agreed between you, leave them in their religion and their land." The caliph Umar treated them very kindly and justly. While imposing taxes upon them he was very careful to find out that enough was left for their maintenance. Even on the eve of his death, he did not forget them and left instructions to his successor that he should treat them justly and that he should keep the agreement made with them; and that he should not overburden them with taxation. Such were the injunctions of the immediate successors of the Prophet who put the ideals of their master in actual practice.

Non-Muslims under the Umayyads

(Damascus)

The advent of Umayyads to power inaugurates the second phase in the history of the treatment of the non-Muslim subjects in Muslim societies. The founder of this dynasty was Muawiyah who wrested political power from the hands of Hazrat Ali, the last of the rightly guided Caliphs, through unfair means and as such the Caliphate founded by him lacked certain fundamental characteristics of an Islamic State. Firstly, he was not elected by the people and therefore his Caliphate did not rest on the unanimous consent of the people. Moreover, he introduced the system of hereditary succession by nominating his unworthy son, Yezid, as his successor.

Under the altered circumstances, certain other changes also crept into the politics of Islam. The universal character of *Shura* had undergone a fundamental change and alterations in the pension list were also effected in favour of the Umayyad partisans. But the worst change which was effected and cost the Umayyads their throne and power in the East, was with regard to the treatment which they meted out to the new converts known as *Mawalis*. The latter had to suffer during most part of the Umayyad regime from all kinds of disabilities, social, economic and political. Even *Jizia*, a capitation tax which was charged from the non-Muslims, was levied upon them and they were not allowed even to enlist themselves in the Government army.

In such circumstances, it may be thought that the worldly Umayyads might have also deviated from the Quranic injunction, 'No compulsion in matters of faith' with regard to their treatment towards their non-Muslim subjects. However, in this respect, the

Umayyads did not change their policy and continued to give not only tolerant but generous treatment to their non-Muslim subjets. This accounts for their marvellous conquests on four fronts simultaneously within a period of one decade. Their base of operation being at Damascus, it would have been impossible for them to score marvellous victories among the non-Muslim subjects in the east upto Sind and Multan, in the West, upto Narbonne and in the North and upto the confines of China, had they not been supported and welcomed by the local population.

Although the Umayyads deviated from certain fundamentals of Islam in their political administration, they stuck very strictly to the Quranic injuction with regard to their treatment towards their non-Muslim subjects. Originally confined to the *Ahl-al Kitab* of the Quran (believers of the revealed books) who came under the rule of Islam, the tolerated status was later extended by the Muslims to include the fireworshipping Zoroastrians, the heathens of Harran and the pagan Berbers. Though no devotees of a revealed religion and thus technically outside the pale of protection, the Persian Zoroastrians and the North African Berbers were offered by the Muslims the same measure of toleration which was granted to the followers of the revealed books e. g. the Jews and the Christians.

Muhammad bin Qasim, the conqueror of Sind and Multan, obtained, at an early stage in his victorious career, the permission of the Caliph to grant to the Hindu and Buddhist temples of the conquered land the same status as had previously been accorded to the Christian churches and Jewish synagogues in other parts of the Muslim world. He granted to the Brahmins the rights and privileges formerly enjoyed by them under Hindu rule. Local people were freely employed by the conqueror to serve as Government employees. He even appointed to the post of Wazir the former Prime Minister of Rajah Dahir, the ruler of Sind.

Muhammad bin Qasim's activities in Sind during his short sojourn were manifold. He organised the life of the Province on sound basis and gave it political stability and economic prosperity. The Government of the Province was organised on the same lines as in other provinces of the Caliphate. A large and well organised army was entrusted with the onerous task of maintaining peace in the land.

After the fall of Multan no financial subsidy was forwarded by Muhammad bin Qasim to the Central treasury. All the revenue derived from the newly conquered country was spent inside the country itself and in the interest of its own inhabitants.

Muhammad bin Qasim organised the revenue system of Sind on a basis highly beneficial to the tillers of the soil. One-fourth of the actual produce was assessed as the land tax due to the Government which was also reserved for the well-being of the people and not to feed the coffers of the Caliph.

The administration of justice was organized on Islamic principles with sufficient scope for non-Muslims to be dealt with according to the laws of their own religions. The local inhabitants of the country were allowed to have their own Panchayats which were left free to work efficiently according to their own traditional practices.

On account of his tolerant attitude towards the inhabitants of the conquered territories, his wise administration and sagacious political handling of the every new situation, his full confidence in the Hindu employees of the newly established government and his personal charm and noble character, Muhammad bin Qasim was perfectly successful in creating a congenial atmosphere in the country and the people of Sind and Multan came to bear high regard for him in their heart. Hindu soldiers came forward to be enlisted in the new army organised by him and fought against the armies of their co-religionists. In fact, he was so much loved and respected that when the news of his recall was received in Sind, the Hindus of the province wept bitterly and the annals of this land resounded for a long time with songs and praises for this young conqueror who made a name for himself in history rarely to be surpassed by any other conqueror or ruler of men.

The non-Muslim communities enjoyed an almost complete autonomy, for the government placed in their hands the Independent management of their internal affairs, and their religious leaders exercised judicial functions in cases that concerned their co-religionists only. Their churches and monasteries were, for the most part, not interfered with. The opinion of the Muslim legists is very diverse on this question, from the more liberal Hanafi doctrine, which declares that, though it is unlawful to construct churches and synagogues in Muslim territory, those already existing can be repaired if they have been destroyed or have fallen into decay, while in villages and hamlets where the tokens of Islam do not appear, new churches and synagogues may be built. Some legists held that the privileges varied according to treaty rights ; in towns taken by force, no new houses of prayer might be erected by *dhimmis*, but if a special treaty had been made the building of new churches and synagogues was allowed. But these prescriptions bore but little relation to actual facts. We have numerous instances recorded, both by Christian and Muhammadan historians, of the building of new churches, e. g., in the reign of Abd al-Malik (685-705), a wealthy Christian of Edessa, named Athanasius, erected in his native city a fine church dedicated to the mother of God, and Baptistry in honour of the picture of Christ that was reputed to have been sent to king Abgar; he also built a number of churches and monasteries in various parts of Egypt, among them two magnificent churches in Fustat. Some Christian chamberlains in the service of Abd al-Aziz b. Marwan (Brother of Abd al-Malik), the Governor of Egypt, obtained permission to build a church in Halwan which was dedicated to St. John, though this town was a Muslim creation. In A. C. 711 a Jacobite church was built at Antioch by the order of Caliph al-Walid (705-715). In the first year of the reign of Yazid II (A.C. 720), Mar Elias, the Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch, made a solemn entry into Antioch, accompanied by his elergy and monks, to consecrate a new church which he had caused to be built; and in the following year he consecrated another church in the village of Sarmada, in the district of Antioch, and the only opposition he met with was from the rival Christian sect that accepted the Council of Chalcedon. In the following reign, Khalid al-Qasri, who was governor of Arabian and Persian Iraq from 724 to 738 A. C., built a church for his mother, who was Christian, to worship in.

Indeed, so far from the development of the Christian Church being hampered by the establishment of Muhammadan rule, the history of the Nestorians exhibits a remarkable outburst of religious life and energy from the time of their becoming subject to the

Muslims. Alternately petted and persecuted by the Persian kings, in whose dominions by far the majority of the members of this sect were found, it had passed a rather precarious existence and had been subjected to harsh treatment, when war between Persia and Byzantines exposed it to the suspicions of sympathising with the Christian enemy. But, under the rule of the Muslims, the security they enjoyed at home enabled them to vigorously push forward their missionary enterprises abroad. Missionaries were sent into China and India, both of which were raised to the dignity of metropolitan sees in the eighth century; about the same period they gained a footing in Egypt, and later spread the Christian faith right across Asia, and by the eleventh century had gained many converts from among the Tatars.[1] The same writer opines that if the other Christian sects failed to exhibit the same vigorous life, it was not the fault of the Muslims. All were tolerated alike by the supreme government, and further-more, were prevented from persecuting one another.

In the fifth century, Barsauma, a Nestorian bishop, had persuaded the Persian king to set on foot a fierce persecution of the Orthodox Church, by representing Nestorians as a friend of the Persians and his doctrines as approximating to their own; as many as 7,000 of the Orthodox clergy, with an enormous number of laymen, are said to have been butchered during this persecution. Another persecution was instituted against the Orthodox by Khusrau II, after the invasion of Persia by Heraclius, at the instigation of a Jacobite, who persuaded the king that the Orthodox would always be favourably inclined towards the Byzantines. But the principles of Muslim toleration forbade such acts of injustice as these; on the contrary, it seems to have been their endeavour to deal fairly by all their Christian subjects; e. g. after the conquest of Egypt, the Jacobites took advantage of the expulsion of the Byzantine authorities to rob the Orthodox of their churches, but later they were restored by the Muslims to their rightful owners when these had made good their claim to possess them.

---

1. T. Arnold "Preaching of Islam" P. 68.

Of the ancient churches in Western Asia at the time of the Muslim conquest, there still survive about 150,000 Nestorians, and their number would have been larger but for the proselytising efforts of other Christian churches; the Chaldees who submitted to the Church of Rome number 70,000; in 1898 the Nestorian Bishop Mar Jonan, with several of the clergy and 15,000 Nestorians was received into the Orthodox Russian Church and a number of Nestorians has also become Protestant. The Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch exercises jurisdiction over about 80,000 members of this ancient Syrian Catholic Patriarch. Belonging to the Greek Orthodox Church, there are 28,836 families under the Patriarch of Antioch and more than 15,000 persons under the Patriach of Jerusalem; while the Melchites or Greek Catholics number about 130,000. The Maronite Church,[1] which has been in union with the Roman Catholic Church since the year 1182, A. C. has a following of 3000,000.[1]

Christians Employed in State Service

Muawiyah (660-680) A. C. employed Christians very largely in his service and other members of the reigning house followed his example. Christians frequently held high posts at Court, e. g. a Christian Arab, al-Akhtal, was court poet, and the father of St. John of Amascus, counsellor to Caliph Adb al-Malik (685-705) A. C. The latter also appointed a certain Athanasius, a Christian scholar of Edessa, tutor to his brother Abd al-Aziz. Athanasius accompanied his pupil, when he was appointed Governor of Egypt, and there amassed great wealth; he is said to have possessed 4000 slaves, numerous villages, houses, gardens and gold and silver like stones; his sons took a *dinar* from each of the soldiers when they received their pay, and as there were 30,000 troops then in Egypt, some idea may be formed of the wealth that Athanasius accumulated during the twenty one years that he spent in that country. At the close of the eighth century, a certain Abu Nuh al-Anbari was secretary to Abu Musa b. Musab, governor of Mosul, and used his powerful influence for the benefit of his Christian co-religionists.

---

1. J. Arnold, *Preaching of Islam* P. 80.

Such was the tolerant and generous attitude of the Umayyad Caliphs towards the Christians that in such inaccessible regions as the Lebanon, the Christians remained always in the ascendant and defied even Abd al-Malik at the height of the Umayyad Caliphate. Throughout the reign of the Umayyad Caliphate, the Christians were well treated. Some of the Caliphs entered into matrimonial alliances with the Christians. Muawiya's wife was a Christian, as were his poet, physician and Secretary of Finance.

Had the Umayyad Caliphs chosen to adopt a policy of coercion or persecution they might have swept away Christianity as easily as Ferdinand and Isabella drove Islam out of Spain or Louis IV made Protestantism penal in France, or the Jews were kept out of England for 350 years The Eastern Churches in Asia were entirely cut off from communion with the rest of Christendom, throughout which no one would have been found to lift a finger on their behalf as heretical communions. So that the very survival of these Churches to the present day is a strong proof of the generally tolerant attitude of the Muslim Governments towards them.

Non-Muslims under the Umayyads of Spain

In order to estimate the beneficial effects of the conquest of Spain by the Muslims one has got to take into consideration the condition of the people in that peninsula.

In the beginning of the eighth century, when the Muslims had reached the African shore of the Atlantic and were looking across the Srtaits of Hercules to the sunny provinces of Andalusia, the Goths had been in possession of Spain for more than two hundred years. They were quite as corrupt and immoral as the Roman nobles who had preceded them, and their style of Christianity did not lead them to endeavour to improve the condition of their subjects. Never was the condition of the country or of the people so bad or so miserable as under the grinding yoke of the Gothic kings. As in the Roman times, the rich, the noble and the privileged classes in general were exempt from taxation ; the middle classes upon whom alone fell the public burdens, were reduced to ruin and misery. Industrial activity was killed by heavy imposts ; there was no manufacture or commerce ; and a terrible sterility, almost equal to that which has fallen on the land since the expulsion of the Muslims, prevailed all over the Peninsula. The country was split up into immense domains whose owners, lay and cleric, lived in palatial mansions where they spent their days in riotous and wicked indulgence. Cultivation was in the hands of either serfs tied to the soil, or of miserable herds of slaves who worked under the pitiless lashes of cruel overseers. Serfs or slaves, for them there was no hope of freedom or gleam of sunshine on this side of the grave. Neither serf nor slave might possess anything that he could call his own ; they could not marry without the consent of the master ; and if the serfs or two neighbouring estates intermarried, their children were divided equally between the two owners. Sunk in the grossest superstitions, their moral state was as depraved and degraded as their material condition was wretched.

The Jews, who had settled in large numbers in the peninsula, had suffered terribly from the persecutions of the kings, the clergy and the nobles. Goaded by their sufferings, they had attempted a rising, which badly conceived and hastily executed, proved abortive with the direst results. Their goods and chattels, in fact all they possessed, was confiscated ; such of the nation as survived the massacre were condemned to wholesale slavery. Old and young, male and female, were made over as slaves to the Christians. The old, as a matter of grace, were allowed to retain their religion but the young were to be brought up in the Christian faith. All marriage within the community was forbidden, and a Jewish slave was henceforth to marry a Christian slave. Such was the punishment meted out to the Jews by the Bishops who held all the power in the land. The impoverished and ruined citizen, the wretched slave, the miserable serf, the persecuted and hunted Jew, all waited for the relief which was long in coming. It was in the moment of their acutest agony that the deliverance arrived from an unexpected quarter. The Saracenic Province on the other side of the Straits was regarded as a heaven of safety by the victims of Gothic and ecclesiastical oppression, and many Spaniards had found refuge in Muslim Africa from the grinding tyranny of their kings and bishops.

Such was the condition of Spain when the Muslims approached her borders. A corrupt aristocracy divided the land among themselves ; the great estates were tilled by a wretched and hopeless race of serfs ; the citizen classes were ruined. On the other side of the straits of Gibralter were the soldiers of Islam, all hardy warriors, fired with the fervour of a new faith, bred to arms from their childhood, simple and rough in their life, and eager to conquer the rich lands of Spain. Between two such peoples there could be no doubt as to the issue of the fight.

The Muslims entered into Spain without much opposition. The citizens opened their gates with ease and grace and the whole country was conquered in less than two years. With the conquest of the peninsula, pacification was also carried on simultaneously and an efficient government with the help of great talents was soon established.

At first, of course, there was a brief period of confusion, some burning, pillaging, massacring; but this was soon checked up by the Arab governors. When things had settled down again, the subject populations found themselves much better than before and began to feel that they had benefited by the change of rulers. They were permitted to retain their own laws and judges; governors of their own race administered the districts, collected the taxes, and determined such differences as arose amongst themselves. The citizen classes, instead of bearing the whole burden of the State expenditure, had only to pay Jizia of no very exacting amount, and were free of all obligations, unless they held cultivable land, in which case they paid the Kharaj or land-tax as well. Jizia was graduated according to the rank of the payer, from twelve to forty-eight dirhems a year, or from about three to twelve pounds at our present purchasing power of money, and its collection in twelve monthly instalments made it the easier to meet. The Jizia was not a compulsory tax but optional and was only charged in lieu of exemption from military service and the guarantee given to the Christians and the Jews for the protection of their person, property and religious beliefs. It was levied only upon Christians and Jews; on the other hand, the Kharaj which varied according to the productiveness of the soil, was assessed equally on Christians, Jews and Muslims. As a rule the old proprietors and citizens preserved their property as before the conquest. The lands evacuated by the fleeing land-owners were no doubt seized with the serfs attached to the land. They were required to pay a certain proportion, varying from a third to four-fifths, of the produce, to their new Muslim lords. Sometimes the cities, such as Merida and Orihuela, had been able to obtain exceptionally favourable terms from the conquerors, and were suffered to retain their goods and lands upon the payment of a fixed tribute. The Christians were in no way subject to heavier exactions than their Muslim neighbours. They had even gained a right which had never been permitted them by the Gothic kings; they could alienate their land. In religious toleration they had nothing to regret. Instead of persecuting them, and forcing upon them a compulsory conversion, as the Goths had upon the Jews, the Arabs left them free to worship whom or what they pleased. The result was that the Christians were satisfied with the new regime, and openly admitted that they preferred the rule of the Moors to that of the Franks or Goths. Even their priests, who had lost most of all, were at first a little incensed with the change, as the old chronicle ascribed to Isidore of Boja, written at Cordova in 1754, shows. The good monk is not even scandalized at so unholy an alliance as the marriage between Roderick's widow and the son of Musa. But the best proof of the satisfaction of the Christians with their new rulers is the fact that there was not a single religious revolt during the eight centuries.

Above all, the slaves, who had been cruelly ill used by the Goths, were treated most generously. Slavery is a very mild and humane institution in the hands of a good Muslim. The Prophet of Islam, while unable to do away with an ancient institution, which we nevertheless repugnant to the socialistic principles of Islam, did his utmost to soften the rigours of slavery. "God", said he, "hath ordained that your brothers should be your slaves; therefore him whom God hath ordained to be the slave of his brother, his brother must give him of the food which he eateth himself, and of the clothes wherewith he clotheth himself, and not order him to do anything beyond his power...A man who ill-treats his slave will not enter into paradise". There is no more commendable action in Islamic Morals than to free slaves, and such enfranchisement is sanctioned by the Prophet especially as an atonement for an undeserved blow or other injustices. In Andalusia, the slaves upon the estates that had passed from the Christians into the possession of Muslim were almost in the position of small farmers; their Muslim masters whose trade was war, and who despised heartily such menial occupations as tilling the soil, left them free to cultivate the land as they pleased, and only insisted on a fair return of products. Slaves of Christians, instead of being hopelessly condemned to servitude for all their lives, were provided with the simplest possible road to freedom; they had only to go to the nearest Muslim of repute, and repeat the formula of belief, "There is no god but God, and Muhammad is His Prophet," and they became immediately free. Conversion to Islam thus carried with it enfranchisement, and it is no wonder that we find the Spanish slaves hastening to profess the new faith and thus to become free men. The Catholic priest had taken small pains to graft the Christian religion into their hearts; they had enough to do to look after their estates and the souls of the nobles without troubling themselves about the spiritual wants of the ignorant; and the change from semi-pagan, semi-Christian status to a perhaps equally unintelligent apprehension of Islam was no very severe wrench to the servile mind. Nor were the slaves by any means the only converts to the new religion. Many of the large proprietors and men of position became Muslims, either to avoid the jizia-tax, or to preserve their estates, or because they honestly admired the simple grandeur of this latest presentment of ethics. These converts or renegades were destined to cause some trouble in the State. While admitted to the equality involved in conversion, they were not reall allowed equal rights and privileges; they were excluded from the offices of State and regarded with suspicion by the Muslims de la vielle roche as interested converts, people who would sell their souls for pell. In the end these distinctions died out, but not before they had produced serious dissensions and even insurrections.

As far as the vanquished were concerned, we have seen that the conquest of Andalusia by the Arabs was on the whole a benefit. It did away with the overgrown estates of the great nobles and churchmen, and converted them into small proprietorships; it removed the heavy burdens of the middle classes, and restricted the taxation to the test tax per poll levied on unbelievers, and the land tax levied equally on Muslims and Christians; and it induced a wide-spread emancipation of the slaves, and a radical improvement in the condition of the unemancipated, who now became almost independent farmers in the service of their non-agricultural Muslim masters.

The result of this large-hearted toleration shown towards the non Muslim subjects by the Muslims was that for nearly eight centuries, under her Muslim rulers, Spain set to all Europe a shining example of a civilized and enlightened State. Her fertile provinces, rendered doubly prolific by the industry and engineering skill of her conquerors, bore fruit an hundred fold. Cities innumerable sprang up in the rich valleys of the Quadelquivir and Guadina, whose names, and names only, still commemorate the vanished glories of their past. Art, literature, and science prospered, as they then prospered nowhere else in Europe. Students flocked from France and Germany and England to drink from the fountain of learning which flowed only in the cities of the Moors. The surgeons and doctors of Andalusia were in the van of science ; women were encouraged to devote themselves to serious study, and the lady doctor was not unknown among the people of Cordova. Mathematics, astronomy and botany, history, philosopy and jurisprudence were to be mastered in Spain, and Spain alone. The practical work of the field, the scientific methods of irrigation, the arts of fortification and shipbuilding, the highest and most elaborate products of the loom, the graves and the hammer, the porter's wheel and the mason's trowel, were brought to perfection by the Spanish Moors. In the practice of war no less than in the arts of peace they long stood supreme. Their fleets disputed the command of the Mediterranean with the Fatimides, while their armies carried fire and sword through the Christian marches. The Cid himself, the national hero, long fought on the Moorish side, and in all save education was more than half a Moor. Whatsoever makes a kingdom great and properous, whatsoever tends to refinement and civilization, was found in Muslim Spain.

Chapter V

Non-Muslims under the Abbasids

With the advent of the Abbasids to power, the position of the members of the protected faiths was not affected ; as the latter always acted upon the injunction of the Holy Quran 'No compulsion in matters of faith' in their treatment with the non-Muslims. Originally Scriptuaries, viz. Christians, Jews and Sabians, the Dhimmis (non-Muslims) had their status widened, to include Zoroastrains, Manichaeans, Harran Sabians and others-all of them were now treated on a par with those with whom a compact for religious tolerance had been made. In country places and on their farms these dhimmis clung to their ancient cultural patterns and preserved their native languages : Aramic and Syrian in Syria and al-Iraq, Iranian in Persia and Coptic in Egypt.

Even in cities Christians and Jews often held important financial clerical and professional positions. (This often led to open jealousy on the part of the Muslim populace and found expression in official enactments. But most of this discriminating legislation remained 'ink on paper' and was not consistently enforced.)

In the service of the Caliph al-Mutasim (833-42) there were two Christian brothers who stood very high in the confidence of the Commander of the Faithful ; one named Saimuyah seems to have occupied somewhat the position of a modern Secretary of State, and no royal documents were valid until countersigned by him, while his brother Ibrahim was entrusted with the care of the privy seal, and was set over the Beytal Mal or Public Treasury, an office that, from the nature of the funds and their disposition, might have been expected to have been put into the hands of a Muslim ; so great was the Caliph's personal affection for this Ibrahim that he visited him in his sickness and was overwhelmed with grief at his death, andon the day of the funeral ordered the body to be brought to the palace and Christian rites performed there with great solemnity.

In the reign of al-Mutadid (892-902), the Governor of Anbar, Umar b. Yousuf, was a Christian, and the Caliph approved of his appointment on the ground that if a Christian were found to be competent, a post might well be given to him. Al-Muwaffaq, who was the virtual ruler of the Empire during the reign of his brother al-Mutamid (870-892) entrusted the administration of the army to a Christian named Israel, and his son al Mutamid had as one of his secretaries another Christian, Malik b. al-Walid. In a later reign, that of al-Muqtadir (908-932), a Christian was again in charge of the war office.

Nasr b. Harun, the prime Minister of Adadud Dawlah (949-982) of the Buwahid dynasty of Persia, who ruled over Southern Persia and Iraq, was a Christian. For a long time, the Government offices, especially in the department of finance, were filled with Christians and Persians ; to a much later date was such the case in Egypt where at times the Christians almost entirely monopolised such posts. Particularly as physicians, the Christians frequently amassed great wealth and were much honoured. Gabriel, the personal physician of the Caliph Harun al-Rashid, was a Nestorian Christian and derived a yearly income of 800, 000 dirhams from his private property in addition to an emolument of 280, 000 dirhams a year in eturn for his attendance on the Caliph ; the second physician, also Christian, received 22, 000 dirhams a year.

In such lucrative occupations as banking, large commercial entures, linen trade, land ownership, medical profession, etc, the hristians and Jews were well represented and firmly established. n fact, the most amazing feature of the Abbasid Caliphate had been he preponderating number of non-Muslims in State Service. heir number had reached such an alarming extent that it seemed s if the Muslims were being ruled by the members of the protected aiths in their own State.

Most of the agricultural land remained in possession of the non-Muslims who were charged Kharaj on very equitable basis; and if any Muslim acquired landed property he was also charged the same tax. There was no difference between a Muslim and a non-Muslim with regard to the payment of land tax. Non-Muslims as before were charged a nominal tax known as Jizia which secured for them exemption from military service; while no Muslim could claim such exemption. The Muslims in addition, had to pay a much heavier tax known as Zakat to the Central Treasury.

However, sometimes, the Christians under Muslim rule have had to suffer from the bad faith kept by foreign Christian powers in their relations with Muslim rulers. One of the instances of such repeated breach of faith may be cited as that of the Byzantine Emperior, Nicephorus, in his relations with Harun al-Rashid that caused the Christian name to sink in the nostrils of that great Caliph. Many persecutions of Christians in Muslim countries can be taced either to distrust of their loyalty, excited by the intrigus and interference of Christian foreigners and the enemies of Islam, or to the bad feeling stirred up by the treacherous or brutal behaviour of the latter towards the Muslims.

In spite of this, Christians under the Abbasid Caliphs enjoyed, on the whole, a large measure of toleration which may be inferred from several episodes. A number of religious debates were held in the presence of the Abbasid Caliphs The text of an apology for Christianity delivered in 781 A. C. by Timothy, patriarch of the Nestorians, before al-Mahdi has come down to us, as has also the famous treatise by al-Kindi' professing to be a contemporary account of a controversy held about 819 A. C. before al-Mamun on the comparative merits of Islam and Christianity.

The Caliph Mamun established a regular Council of State, composed of representatives from all the communities under his sway. It thus included Muslims, Jews, Christians, Sabeans, and Zorastrians. Liberty of conscience and freedom of worship had been always enjoyed by non-Muslims under the Islamic regime; any occasional variation in this policy was due to the peculiar temperament of some local governor. Under Mamun, however, th liberality towards other religions was-large hearted and exemplary. In his reign we hear of eleven thousand Christian churches besides hundreds of synagogues and fire temples. The patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch were the heads of the Christian Church. After the Patriarch came the Jasalik (Catholicos), then the Metran (metropolitan), then the Iskal (bishop), and lastly the kissis (the priest). They all retained the privileges and immunities they had enjoyed under sovereigns of their own creed.

Al-Mamun himself was very zealous in his efforts to spread the faith of Islam, and sent invitations to unbelievers even in the most distant parts of his dominions, such as Transoxnia and Farghanah. At the same time he did not abuse his power by attempting to force his own faith upon others : when a certain Yazdanbakht, a leader of the Manicaean sect, came on a visit to Baghdad and held a disputation with the Muslim theologians in which he was utterly silenced, the Caliph tried to induce him to embrace Islam. But Yazdanbakht refused, saying "Commander of the faithful, you are one of those who do not force men to abandon their religion". So far from resenting the ill success of his efforts, the Caliph furnished him with a bodyguard that he might not be exposed to insult from the fanatic populace.

The religious discussions of Ali al-Tabari in his Kitab-al-Din wal Dawlah, a semi official defence and exposition of Islam written at the court with the assistance of al Mutawakkil, is temperate, singularly free from heat and passion and abounds in references to the Bible, evidently the Syriac version or its early Arabic translation. At the time al-Nadim wrote his Fihrist (988) both the Old and New Testaments were already in existence in Arabic in more than one version. These translations aroused the interest of Muslims on controversial reports and we find al-Jahiz (869) among the many who penned an answer to Christians.

The Christian subjects of the Abbasid Caliphs belonged for the most part to the Syrian Churches considered heterodox and commonly called Jacobite and Nestorian. The latter had the right of residence in Baghdad, a privilege which the Jacobites had always sought in vain. Round the patriarchate styled Dayra al-Rum (monastery of the Ramans, i. e. Christiens) there grew in Baghdad a Christian quarter called Dar al Rum. Under the Catholicos' jurisdiction there flourished seven metropolitans, including those of al Basrah, al Mawsil and Nasibin, each with two or three Bishops under him. The patriarch elect received his investiture from the Caliph by whom he was recognized as the official head of all Christians in the empire. The Jacobites who were supposed to be in sympathy with the Byzantines, the political rivals of the Abbasid Caliphs, had also a monastery in Baghdad and a metropolitan seat in Takrit, not far from the capital. In all, Yaqut lists half a dozen monasteries in east Baghdad, apart from those on the west side.

JEWS : As one of the protected peoples the Jews fare on the whole even better than the Christians. In 985 al-Aqdisi found most of the money changers and bankers in Syria to be Jews and most of the clerks and Physicians Christians. Under several Caliphs, particularly al-Mutadid (892-902), we read of more than one Jew in the capital and the provinces assuming responsible state position. In Baghdad itself the Jews maintained a good-sized colony. Benjamin of Tudela, who visited the colony about 1169, found it in possession of ten rabbinical schools and twenty-three synagogues. He depictes in glowing colours the high esteem in which the head of the Babylonian Jews was held as a descendant of David and head of the Community, in fact as chief of all Jews owing allegiance to the Baghdad Caliphate. Just as the Catholics exercised a certain measure of jurisdiction over all Christians in the empire, so did the exilarch over his coreligionists. The prince of the community seems to have lived in affluence and owned gardens, houses and rich plantations. On his way to an audience with the Caliph he appears dressed in embroidered silk, wore a white turban gleaming with gems and was accompanied by a retinue of horsemen. At the head of him marched a herald calling out : Make way before our lord, the son of David.

It was, however, during the period of the Crusades when the relations between the Muslim World and Christendom were disrupted and the feelings were embittered, that the real magnanimity, liberality and tolerance of the Muslims were exhibited par excellence. Muslims did not leave their principles even at that hour of crisis when nations throw all principles over-board.

They story told by Odo of Denilm, a monk of St. Denis, who, in the capacity of private chaplin to Louis VII accompanied him on the ill-fated Second Crusade, shows the Muslims and Christians in their true colours. While endeavouring to make their way overland through Asia Minor to Jerusalem the Crusaders sustained a disastrous defeat at the hands of the Turks in the mountain passes of Phrygia (A. C. 1148), and with difficulty reached the seaport town of Attalia. Here, all who could afford to satisfy the exorbitant demands of the Greek merchants, took ship for Antioch; while the sick and wounded and the mass of the pilgrims were left behind at the mercy of their treacherous allies, the Greeks, who received five hundered marks form Louis, on condition that they provided an escort for the pilgrims and took care of the sick until they were strong enough to be sent on after the others. But no sooner had the army left, than the Greeks informed the Turks of the helpless condition of the pilgrims, and quietly looked on while famine, disease and the arrows of the enemy carried havoc and destruction through the camp of these unfortunates. Driven to desperation, a party of three or four thousand attempted to escape, but were surrounded and cut to pieces by the Turks, who now pressed on to the camp to follow up their victory. The situation of the survivors would have been utterly hopeless had not the sight of their misery melted the hearts of the Muhammadans to pity. They tended the sick and relieved the poor and starving with open-handed liberality. Some even brought up the French money which the Greeks had got out of the pilgrims by force or cunning, and lavishly distributed it among the needy. So great was the contrast between the kind treatment the pilgrims received from the unbelievers and the cruelty of their fellow-Christians, the Greeks, who imposed forced labour upon them, beat them and robbed them of what little they had left, that many of them voluntarily embraced the faith of their deliverers. As the old chronicler says: "Avoiding their co-religionists who had been so cruel to them, they went in safety among the infidels who had compassion upon them, and, as we heard, more than three thousand joined themselves to the Turks when they retired. Oh, kindness more cruel than all treachery. They gave them bread but robbed them of their faith, though it is certain that contented with the services they performed, they compelled no one among them to renounce his religion."

Sultan Salah-al-Din's humanity was in striking contrast with the brutality of the victorious Crusaders. On approaching the city he sent for the principal inhabitants and spoke to them in the following terms: "I know, as you do, that Jerusalem is a holy place. I do not wish to profane it by the effusion of blood; abandon your remparts, and I shall give you a part of my treasures and as much land as you can cultivate". With characteristic fanaticism the Crusaders refused this generous and humane offer. Irritated by their refusal, Salah-al-Din vowed he would avenge on the city the butchery committed by the comrades and soldiers of Godfrey de Bouillon. After the siege had lasted a while, the Crusaders lost heart, and appealed for mercy "in the name of the common Father of mankind". The Sultan's kindness of heart conquerred his desire for punishment. The Greeks and Syrian Christians within Jerusalem received permission to abide in the Sultan's dominions in the full enjoyment of their civil rights and the Franks and Latins who wished to settle in Palestine as subjects of the Sultan were permitted to do so. All the combatants within the city were to leave with their women and children within forty days, under the safe conduct of the Sultan's soldiers. Their ransom was fixed at ten Syrian dinars for each man, five for each woman, and one for each child. On failure to pay the stipulated ransom, they were to remain in bondage. But this was a mere nominal provision. The Sultan himself paid the ransom for ten thousand people, whilst his brother Saif-al-Din released seven thousand more. Several thousand were dismissed by Salah-al-Din's clemency without any ransom. The clergy and the people carried away all their treasures and valuables without the smallest molestation. Several Christians were seen carrying on their shoulders their feeble and aged parents of friends. Touched by the spectacle, the Sultan distributed a goodly sum to them in charity, and even provided them with mules to carry their burdens. When Sybilla, the Queen of Jerusalem, accompanied by the principal matrons and knights, took leave of him, he respected her happiness, and spoke to her with the utmost tenderness. She was followed by a number of weeping women, carrying their children in their arms. Several of them approached the Sultan and addressed him as follows:

"You see us on foot, the wives, mothers, and daughters of warriors who are your prisoners ; we are quitting for ever this country ; they aided us in our lives, in losing them we lose our last hope ; if you will give them to us, they can alleviate our miseries and we shall not be without support on earth ". Salah-al-Din, touched by their prayers, at once restored to the mothers their sons, to the wives their husbands, and promised to treat whoever remained in his power with kindness. He distributed liberal sums among the orphans and widows, and allowed the knights hospitallers, although they had been in arms against him, to continue their work of tending the sick and wounded and looking after the Christian pilgrims.

Salah-al-Din's humanity was in striking contrast with the brutality of the Christian prince, Bohemond in Antioch even towards their own coreligionists. "Many of the Christians who left Jerusalem", says Mills, "Went to Antioch, but Bohemond not only denied them hospitality, but even stripped them. They marched into the Saracenian country, and were well received. Michaud gives some striking details of Christian inhumanity to the exiles from Jerusalem. Repulsed by their brethern of the East, they wandered miserably about Syria, many dying of grief and hunger. Tripoli shut its gates against them, and one woman, urged by despair, cast her infant into the sea, cursing the Christians who refused them succour". Out of respect for the feelings of the vanquished, the Sultan had abstained from entering the city until all the Crusaders had left. The ravages of war were repaired on all sides, the mosques and colleges that had been demolished by the Franks were either restored or rebuilt and a liberal and wise administration was introduced in the government of the country, quite different from the rude tyranny of the Crusaders.

The heroic life and character of Salah-al-Din seems to have exercised a special fascination on the minds of the Christians of his time; even some of the Christian knights were so strongly attracted towards him that they abandoned the Christian faith and their own people and joined themselves to the Muslims ; such was the case, for example, with a certain English Templar named Robert of St. Albans, who in A. C. 1185 gave up Christianity for Islam and afterwards married a grand-daughter of Salah-al-Din. Two years later, Salah-al-Din invaded Palestine and utterly defeated the Christian army in the battle of Hittin, Guy, king of Jerusalem being among the prisoners. On the eve of the battle, six of his knights, "possessed with a devilish spirit," deserted the king and escaped into the camp of Salah-al-Din where of their own accord they became Muslims.

However, during the period of the Crusades there had been no widespread conversion to Islam, and when the Muhamadans resumed their sovereignty over the Holy Land, they extended the same toleration to the Christians as before, suffering them to "purchase peace and quiet" by the payment of the Jizia. Instances have already been given of Christians who took service under Muhammadan masters, in the full enjoyment of their own faith, and the Assises of Jerusalem made a distinction between "those who have denied God and followed another law" and " all those who have done armed service to the Saracens and other miscreants against the Christians for more than a year and a day".

The native Christians certainly preferred the rule of the Muhammadans to that of the Crusaders, and when Jerusalem fell finally and for ever into the hands of the Muslims (A. C. 1244), the Christian population of Palestine seems to have welcomed the new masters and to have submitted quietly and contentedly to their fate.

This same sense of security of religious life under Muslim rule led many of the Christians of Asia Minor also, about the same time, to welcome the advent of the Saljuq Turks as their deliverers from the hated Byzantine government, not only on account of its oppressive system of taxation, but also of the persecuting spirit of the Greek Church, which had with such cruelty crushed the heresies of the Paulicians and the Iconoclasts. In the reign of Michael VIII (1261-1282), the Turks were often invited to take possession of the smaller town in the interior of Asia Minor by the inhabitants, so that they might escape from the tyranny of the empire; and both rich and poor often emigrated into Turkish dominions,

Non-Muslims under the Muslim Rulers of India

In the East, the Muslims came into contect with India when Sind was conquered by Muhammad bin Qasim in 711 A. C. and annexed to the Umayyad Caliphate of Damascus. The territory of Sind at that time included a large part of the Punjab. Since Sind is separated from India by the great Rajputana desert, the eastward march of the Muslims was arrested for the time being, and the Arab annexation of Sind remained an event almost isolated from the history of the rest of India.

By the tenth century A.C. Central Asia and Afghanistan had followed Persia in embracing Islam. The movement of Central Asian Muslims into India commenced towards the close of the tenth century A.C. The Muslim Turks, Persians and Afghans who now began to pour into India brought with them a well established religion of Islam, with its advanced and virile concepts of life and society.

As the bulk of the Indian society was also suffering like other parts of the world from the same social, moral and religious evils and was reduced to the position of mere slaves or serfs either by Brahmans or by the Feudal Lords, India fell an easy pray to these Muslims who were regarded as liberators of suffering humanity. In due course, the whole of India except the extreme South came under Muslim domination and began to be governed directly or indirectly by the Sultans of Delhi. Thus the Muslims became an important part of the population of India and their distinct culture was established side by side with that of the Hindus.

As a Semetic and monotheistic religion, Islam is closely akin to Judaiim and Christianity. The main fundamentals of Islam are that there is only one God, that Muhammad is the last of the Prophets of God and that the Quran is the revealed word of God. Islam has its own code of morality, law and social system. It believes in the equality of man and abhors idolatry. Hinduism, on the other hand, believes in an endless pantheon of deities, some of whom are worshipped, others are propitiated. Every household has its own god or goddess. Transmigration of souls is a basic tenet of Hinduism. The most important feature of Hindu social organisation is its caste system which is based on the belief that human beings are born into particular castes and that their whole life is, governed by rigid rules of divine origin. The four main castes are. firstly, the Brahmans, i.e. the priests who are the equals, if not the superiors of deities; secondly, the Kashtris, the ruling or martial class; thirdly, Vaisyas, the agriculturists and traders; and lastly, the Sudras, the servile class. From the orthodox point of view, all Hindus who belong to the fourth caste as well as those who profess faiths other than Hinduism are considered untouchables. Even the Muslims who were the rulers of the sub-continent were considered as such by the orthodox Hindus.

Their religious and social concepts being so radically different, Hindus and Muslims have, on the whole, always remained apart. Hinduism which interdicts inter-marriages between its own castes and even sub-castes was not expected to permit or encourage inter-marriage with Muslims. Islam, too, bans inter-marriage between Muslims and the followers of polytheistic creeds. The rigidity of the caste system and the serious consequences of expulsion from the caste prevented the Hindus from free intercourse with Muslims The differences between the Hindus and Muslims persisted even in such minor matters as dress, manners of living, eating, etc., not to mention other important matters such as language and literature. In certain points, the Hindus and Muslims differed fundamentally. For instance. the Hindus are idol-worshippers whereas the Muslims have been idol-breakers. The Hindus are not only vegetarians but regard the cow as something sacred and worship it, whereas the Muslims eat the cow.

It is in this background that one has got to appreciate the generous treatment meted out to the non-Muslims of India by their Muslim rulers.

It has already been stated that originally confined to the Ahl-al-Kitab of the Quran (believers of the revealed books) who came under the rule of Islam, the tolerated status was later extended by the Muslim rulers to include the fire-worshipping Zoroastrians, the heathens of Harran and the pagan Berbers of North Africa. Under the same analogy, during the Caliphate of Umayyads, the same measure of toleration was extended by Muhammad bin Qasim when he conquered Sind and Multan to the Polytheists of India.

The Sultans[1] of Delhi like other Muslim rulers considered the subject races as a trust from God in their hands; and thus tried to serve and protect them from all kinds of oppressive acts. On the whole their guiding principle was that of benevolence. The truth of this statement is apparent from the charitable deeds of the Sultans and their nobility, the numerous hospitals, inns and caravanserais, free kitchens for the poor, the measures to fignt famines and droughts, instructions to officers regarding their dealings with the people, and the accessibility of the ruler to the poorest and the most humble of his people. According to Islamic traditions, the Sultans always tried to maintain justice among their people irrespective of caste, colour, religion or race.

The cases arising out of disputes between non-Muslim subjects were decided in the ordinary courts; only the decision was based on customary law. Cases between Muslims and non-Muslims were decided according to principles of equity. Very few cases between Hindu litigants would come to the courts, for the village Panchayats functioned down to the British period.

The general attitude of the state is depicted in Berni's dictum that a sultan who does not gain the support of all his subjects is a usurper. In discussing the duties of a king in times of distress he ays down that the subjects should be helped in every respect, the Kharaj and Jizia should be reduced or even remitted. It is obvious hat as the Jizia was paid only by non-Muslims, they were not to be excluded from the measures of relief. As far as hospitals and serais were concerned there is not only no record of the exclusion of non-Muslims but special arrangements for their convenience are

---

Note.—Most of the material has been taken from the "Administration f Sultanate" by Dr. I. H. Qureshi.

mentioned. The attitude of Muslim rulers is crystaiised in Sher Shah's phrase: "The Muslims and non-Muslims a like are entitled tomy justice".

In the light of the above statements, let us examine the actual position of the non-Muslims in the various fields, viz. religious, political, economic and cultural.

As regards religion, it has already been stated that the Hindus were accorded the status of allied people, (dhimmis) from the very beginning of Muslim rule. Legally they were allowed full religious freedom. They practised their religion openly and with ostentatious display. In distant villages and small towns they could do as they pleased: even in the capital and the provincial centres they worshipped their idols publicly and performed their rites in accordance with their faiths; and on the occasion of their festivals went out in procession, dancing, singing and playing music.

As Islam discourages idol-worshipping, the Hindus were not allowed to build new temples without previous sanction, as has been the case with the building of worshipping houses of Ahl-al-Kitab. In actual practice, there is no instance on record when this permission was withheld. The Muslims were not allowed to demolish any worshipping place already built. If any temples were destroyed, it must have been in newly conquered towns and territories which had refused to submit. Temples built without permission were some times demolished. In certain areas the Hindus demolished mosques and converted them into idol temples; naturally when they were re-conquered, these buildings were reconstructed as mosques and handred over to Muslims.

Politically the Hindus were divided roughly into four classes. The first consisted of the Hindu chiefs. The most important of them were allowed practical independence; the only demand the state made on them was that they should acknowledge the suzerainty of the sultan and be regular in the payment of their tribute. However, they were required to maintain standards of good government and justice in their territories so that universal peace and security be maintained. Next in importance came the smaller chiefs who were also autonomous to a considerable degree. They were employed by the state some times as provincial governors and high revenue officials. They enjoyed such a prestige that excited the jealousy of Muslim writers. The third in rank stood petty revenue officials and clerks. They formed the basis of the bureacracy ruling the land, and, on account of their aptitude and expert knowledge, were valued as civil servants. The non-official middle class comprising traders and skilled artisans was not only left unmolested but was encouraged by patronage and protection. The fourth class consisted of the peasantry who were regarded as the basis of all economic life and as such were to be cherished and protected. Moderation in the revenue demand was the rule; the peasants were protected from the illegal and vexatious demands of both high and low. The cultivators had nothing to fear from their Muslim rulers so long as they paid their dues in time and maintained peace. Indeed the Muslim conquerors claimed that they had delivered the people from tyranny by establishing their benevolent rule. This can be proved by the obvious fact that in such a short time they were able to win the cooperation of large sections of the people.

Economic

The Hindu population was better off under the Muslim rulers than under Hindu tributaries or independant Hindu rulers. Their financial burden was lighter than it had been for some centuries in pre-Muslim days.

In lieu of the protection afforded by the state and exemption from the military service, the Hindus were charged a nominal tax known as Jizia at the rate of ten tankahs[1] per annum from the lower class, twenty from the middle class and forty from the upper class. This was the same tax which was charged from the followers of revealed Books living under the protection of an Islamic State. It was not a compulsory tax but optional. If a non-Muslim offered to render military service, he could be exempted from its payment. Only those persons who were capable of bearing arms were charged this tax as children, women, old and incapacitated persons, monks and religious functionaries devoted solely to their religion were all exempted from this tax. On the other hand the Muslims could not be exempted from military service. As regards the land tax, the Muslims and non-Muslims from the time of the Caliphate of Hazrat Umar stood on equal footing. The rate of the land tax varied from one-fifth to one-half of the produce. In India it was charged mostly at the rate of one-fifth of the produce. Some of the Muslim landholders were charged Ushr, i.e., one-tenth of the produce, but they were few in number. As regards the import duties, there was a little discrimination between the Muslims and the non-Muslims; from the former it was charged at the rate of five per cent while from the latter it was at the rate of 10%. However, a much heavier tax, namely Zakat was charged only from the Muslims at the rate of 2½ per cent on the accumulated income at the end of the year.

---

[1] One tankah was equal to Re 1/- of our times.

It may also be noted that the property of Muslims dying intestate and without heirs belonged entirely to the State, while the property of a dhimmi dying in similar circumstances was handed over to his own community.

Industrially India was in a strong position for it manufactured most of its necessities and exported finished articles like sugar, cloth and arms. Live-stock was plentiful, food was cheap and trade was officially encouraged.

Cultural :

The Government never tried to force its own culture on an unwilling people. The Muslim colleges and schools were open to all who cared to enter their portals; but no one was forced to do so. Muslim rulers and men of letters respected the culture and the knowledge of the Hindus. Muslim sovereigns employed scholars to translate Sanskrit books into Persian. It was the patronage of Muslim provincial courts which laid the foundation of vernacular literature.

As regards the tradition of learning among the Hindus, Khusrau speaks with enthusiasm of their knowledge of science, mathematics and Yoga. Indeed Hindu genius, sometimes under the patronage of Muslim rulers, sometimes quite independently, blossomed forth in a renaissance of literary and religious activity. Among the names of Hindi writers of renown one comes across many Muslims. Khusrau has left some Hindi poetry which is regarded with respect even today. Of greater merit as a Hindi poet was Malik Muhammad Jaisi whose Padmavat and Akhtawat rank among the classics of the world owing to their vigour, beauty and imagery.

Social

Nor was the Hindu despised socially. The Muslims, generally speaking, have always been remarkably free from racial prejudice. On the contrary it was Hinduism which protected itself beneath the strong armour of exclusiveness. The Muslim, in his eyes, was unclean, his very touch polluted the food of the twice-born Brahmans and men of the higher castes ; the new-comer was outside the pale. In fairness to Hinduism, it must be remembered that this treatment was not limited to the Muslims ; but praise cannot be withheld from the conquering race for their tolerance in cheerfully submitting to this humiliation.

The Hindu attitude towards their Muslim rulers can be determined from literary works and folklore where the Sultans are depicted as receiving help from Hindu princes in times of need and rewarding them for their services. Of special interest is a Hindi inscription, partly in Sanskrit and partly in the vernacular, of Haryanah; though as panegyric, it illustrates the Hindu attitude towards the Sultans. It is dated 1337 of the Vikrama era (128) when Balban was on the throne. Lavish praise is bestowed on the Muslim rulers. Balban, in particular, is described as "He, throughout whose contented realm under his great and good government, from Gaur to Ghaznah, from the Dravida country and Rameshwaram everywhere the earth bears the beauty of sylvan spring". So great is the Sultan's care for his people that 'Vishnu himself has retired from the care of the world and gone to sleep on the ocean of milk'. The Sultan's capital, Delhi, also comes in for poetic euology. In another inscription, Muhammad bin Tughluq is praised as "the crest jewel of all rulers of the earth".

These considerations lead us to believe that the care of the Sultans embraced all their subjects ; indeed tolerance was an abiding feature of the government of the Sultanate.

Non-Muslims under Mughal Rulers

The same policy of toleration was continued, after the termination of Sultanate from India, by later rulers who replaced them. However, with the advent to power of Akbar, a new phase entiered into the relations of the State with the non-Muslims. He was an uneducated monarch and was under the strong influence of his courters, Abul Fazl and Faizi, who advised him to create a nation out of heterogeneous people. He, therefore, experimented with a new electic religion called 'Din-i-Elahi', an admixture of Islam, Hinduism and other religions which, however, miserably failed to achieve any tangible results. The short-sighted policy of Akbar resulted in the persecution of orthodox Muslims who were the mainstay of Islamic Culture, the degradation of Islam and strengthening the position of the non-Muslims, particularly of the Rajputs with whom he entered into matrimonial alliances. However, the bases of the two civilizations, one Muslim and, therefore, egalitarian and democratically oriented, and the other Hindu and caste-ridden, were so basically different that they seemed destined to flow like two parallel but separate streams. It had become inevitable that the two nations would never unite.

According to Lanepoole—"Akbar's organisation had welded an empire out of hetero geneous materials with apparent success, but there were flaws into work which threatened to develop into serious cleavage; his religious policy of combining the rules of all prevailing faiths in India had utterly failed, and too much prominence given to non-Muslims had emboldened them beyond control and utter indifference to fundamentals of Islam, had undermined the moral fabric of the Mus-lim society. Two of Akbar's sons died of drink and, the habit of intoxication had become an universal practice among the nobles and officials."

"The old battle cry of Allah had become hollow symbol of the religion which they had studied to forget. Childish superstition or impotent indifference had taken the place of the old faith and immorality and debauchery had followed close upon the loosening of the religious bond. The Muslim successes had engendered luxury.

The hardy troopers of Balkh had grown soft in the plains of India and they had thrown away their old habits of manliness."

The abolition of Jizia by Akbar had removed the sense of inferiority from the minds of the Hindus who were placed on an equal footing with the conquering race ; and the Rajputs had now begun to take active part even in matters of succession. Jahangir restored the rites and institutions of Islam that had come under eclipse because of Akbar's heterodoxy, and Shah Jahan is also regarded as orthodox in his approach to religious matters. However Shah Jahan's policy was vacillating to such a degree that the determination usually engendered by religious feelings was completely absent. On account of the powerful influences of Rajputs and other Hindu officials, both these rulers could not dare to reimpose Jizia during their reign.

As soon as Aurangzeb felt himself secure on the throne, he realised that there were only two methods by which the Muslims could keep their control over India which was inhabited mostly by the Hindus : either by maintaining their superior ideology of Islam with a ruler of lofty character at the helm of affairs or by creating a majority of the Muslims in the country. The latter contingency was not an immediate possibility. Therefore, the former was the only alternative, which was wisely chosen by Aurangzeb.

He started the introduction of reforms which could make his dominion a proper Islamic State. With this object in view, he appointed censors of public morals (Muhtasibs) in all important cities to inforce Islamic law and put down practices forbidden by Shariat such as drinking, gambling and prostitution. He also forbade the cultivation of Bhang throughout the empire. He abolished all illegal exactions and all taxes which were not authorised by Islamic law. The ceremony of weighing the Emperor on his birthday against gold and silver was discarded and in 1679 A.C. the ceremony of darshan was also abandoned. In the course of time the festivities held on the Emperor's birthday and the Mansabdars were forbidden to make the customary presents to the emperor. In 1668 A.C. he forbade music at his court and, with the exception of the royal band, pensioned off the large number of state musicians and singers. He considered the Public Treasury as a trust in his hands from God and would not touch a penny out of it even for his bare maintenance, and would rather like to earn his own livilihood through manual labour. One of Aurangzeb's earliest acts after his accession was to prohibit the Nauroz and revert to the lunar reckoning of orthodox Islam.

As Aurangzeb desired to run the empire in accordance with Islamic law, this brought the question of the position of non-Muslims to the fore. In 1673 A.C. the Jizia, which had remained abolished for nearly a century, was re-imposed on the non-Muslims. By now Aurangzeb had accepted the policy of regulating his government in accordance with strict orthodox Islamic law and many orders in furtherance of this policy were issued. The re-imposition of Jizia was not made with a view to increase the revenue of the State. If so, he would not have abolished all those taxes which had no sanction in Islamic law, by which act, the non-Muslims who happened to be in majority, were the greatest beneficiaries. Moreover, it may be understood that the levy of Jizia from the non-Muslims was not compulsory but optional. If the non-Muslims could be relied upon and were willing to render military service, they could be exempted from this tax; while on the other hand, no Muslim could claim exemption from military service under any circumstances.

In 1669 A.C. Aurangzeb was informed that the Brahmans of Benaras and Hindu courtiers were in the habit of teaching their wicked science not only to their own people but also to Muslims. This was more than the orthodox Emperor could tolerate. He, therefore, issued orders for the destruction of those temples where such teaching was imparted. All that was done was to make a few signal examples and thus to restrain the Brahmans from attempting to make proselytes among the True Believers.

It is, however, incontestible that at a certain stage Aurangzeb tried to enforce strict Islamic law by ordering the destruction of newly built Hindu temples. He obviously did not relish this step and later, the procedure was adopted of closing down rather than destroying the newly built temples in Hindu localities. As a part of general policy of ordering the affairs of the State in accordance with the views of the Ulama certain discriminatory orders against the Hindus were issued (for example imposition of higher custom duties, 5 p.c. on the goods of the Hindus as against 2½ p.c. on those of the Muslims. This was due to the fact that Shariat Law did make distinction between the taxes paid by the Muslims and non-Muslims. In fact, Muslims were required to pay heavier taxes. For instance, Zakat which was the source of the largest amount of income, was only payable by the Muslims. Aurangzeb has also been accused of closing the doors of official employment on the Hindus, but as a study of the list of his officers shows, this is completely baseless. Actually there were more Hindu officers under him than under any Mughal Emperor. In fact, Aurangzeb's policy towards the Hindus was misunderstood and the public was instigated by interested parties to revolt against him. It was forgotten that he had remitted nearly eighty taxes and cesses paid mainly and in many cases entirely by the Hindus, but the imposition of Jizia, was carefully noted and resented.

It has been often stated that the offence which Aurangzeb gave to the Hindus by his religious policy created confusion in his kingdom and led to the downfall of the Mughal empire. That it is not so becomes clear from a study of Aurangzeb's reign. As Dr. Tara Chand says, "the Hindu risings were not successful and they were not inspired by any common aims, whether religious or political. Aurangzeb suppressed them with Hindu help. Aurangzeb did not interfere with the celebration of private religious worship of his Hindu subjects. He did not forbid their priests from teaching the Hindus their religious doctrines. He did not exclude them from the public services. According to Lanepoole, a profound tranquillity, broken by no rebellion of any political importance, reigned throughout northern India for the first twenty years of Aurangzeb's rule. 'So quiet, indeed, was the country, so absolute the security of the rown that Aurangzeb was able with an easy mind to allow himself a rest and change of scene in Kashmir for a period of one year and a half. On his return from his long repose in Kashmir where he seems o have spent the greater part of 1665, Aurangzeb found his empire as tranquil as he had left it."

The ideal of kingship which Aurangzeb had set before him was of a very high standard; and in order to put this ideal into actual practice, he had to reorganise his own administration without which he could not have accomplished his cherished desire. He, therefore, took early steps to revitalise the administration which had greatly deteriorated during the prolonged war of succession. As soon as he had dealt with his rivals, he turned towards the reorganisation of the civil government. A period of strong government began. Everywhere the provincial governors began to assert imperial prestige. Energetic Subedars extended the bounds of the empire to Assam, Chittagong, Palarmau and other tracts. Local notables found that disobedience of orders or independent attitude would be tolerated no longer. The border tribes were taught that no violation of the imperial frontiers would go unpunished.

Aurangzeb had a high conception of the duties of a king which he tried to discharge in a spirit of dedication and self-denying application to state business. He assiduously followed the exacting daily routine of attending to governmental work, of dispensing justice and of making himself accessible to his subjects. With abstemiousness in food, drink and dress, he lived for his subjects and not off them. The central treasury was a sacred trust for him and in spite of heavy duties, he found time to earn money for his meagre needs by copying the Holy Quran and sewing caps.

Throughout his long reign of nearly fifty years no single deed of cruelty had been proved against him. No instance of violating the precepts of the religion he professed has ever been produced, nor is there the smallest evidence that he ever forced his conscience. He undoubtedly put himself forth for the cause of God, a mere instrument to do God's people some good, and God's service. He was first and last a stern Puritan. Nothing in life, neither throne nor love, nor ease weighed for an instant in his mind against his fealty to the principles of Islam.

There was nothing but his own conscience to prevent Aurangzeb from adopting the electic philosophy of Akbar, the luxurious profligacy of Jahangir, or the splendid ease of Shah Jahan. Probably any other Mughal prince would have followed in the steps of his forefathers, and emulated the indolence and vice of the court in which he had received his earliest impressions. Aurangzeb did none of these things. For the first time in their history, the Mughals beheld a rigid Muslim in their Emperor as sternly repressive of himself as of the people around him, a king who was prepared to stake his throne for the sake of the faith. He must have known that compromise and conciliation formed the easiest and safest policy in an empire composed of heterogeneous elements of race and religion, yet he chose this course and adhered to it with unbending resolve through close on fifty years of unchallenged sovereignty.

Too much has been made of the religious fanaticism of Aurangzeb and the discriminatory treatment of non-Muslims which alienated the Rajputs and secured popular Hindu support for the Marathas. This is not wholly true. If he is accused of re-imposing the Jizia on non-Muslims which was required by the law of Islam, his critics forget that he had also abolished about eighty taxes which had no justification in Islam including the time-honoured tax on the religious festivals and fairs of the unbelievers. He also repudiated the established Mughal custom of confiscating to the Crown the estates of deceased owners to the detriment of their natural heirs.

Aurangzeb's desire to champion orthodoxy without championing the policy of toleration which the Muslims had followed throughout their long period of rule in this country was misunderstood and misinterpreted and was used to stir up popular passions and prejudices. Neither the Rajput wars nor his long-drawn campaigns against the Marathas and the two Muslim kingdoms of the Deccan were inspired by religious motives. The chief object was to fight against organised anarchy in the country which boded good for no one. In this truggle against the forces of disruption he never lost his balance in treating his subjects with justice and working assiduously for their welfare.

The Muslim rulers of India extended the same measure of toleration to the polytheists in India which was extended, and rightly so, to the followers of revealed religions in the West. Besides, like their counter-parts in the West, Muslim rulers in India neglected the preaching of Islam and thus Muslims remained in minority even in capital cities like Delhi and Agra. The Muslims being in minority could hold their political supremacy over the majority community only by their superior ideology whose lustre was blurred owing to the intrusion of extraneous elements in the body politic of Indian Islam. The ill-defined system of hereditary succession brought about degeneration among the successors and the absence of a strong ruler after the death of Auranzeb hastened the decline of the Muslim rule in India. After the death of Aurangzeb (1707), the last of the great Mughal Emperors, the Empire entered a period of decay. The control at the centre became lax, and the decline and disintegration of political power was accelerated. Independent principalities sprung up all over the country and began to war among themselves. The political vacuum gave rise to an era of anarchy which gave a chance to the East India Company to build up an Empire governed from abroad.

The advent of British into the sub-continent enslaved the Indians, including the Muslims, for about two centuries, but ultimately it proved a blessing in disguise for the Muslims. In the absence of a foreign power, after the disintegration of the Mughal Empire, the Muslims must needs have surrendered political power to the Hindus. Had it been so, the Muslims of India would have met the same fate which befell the Muslims of Spain, as the Hindus would not have proved less persecuting than the Catholics of Spain.

Non-Muslims Under Turkish Sultans

From the earliest days of the extension of their kingdom in Asia Minor the Ottomans exercised authority over Christian subjects, but it was not until the ancient capital of the Eastern Empire fell into their hands in 1453 that the relations between the Muslim Government and the Christian Church were definitely established on a fixed and solid basis. One of the first steps taken by Muhammad the Conqueror, after the capture of Constantinople and the re-establishment of order in that city, was to secure the allegiance of the Christians. He rightly judged that it was necessary that the mass of the Greek population which had escaped death and captivity during the sack of the city should be encouraged to remain there, and be orderly and industrious subjects of their new masters. The measures taken by him with this object in view attest the clear-sighted statesmanship which he possessed. In the first instance he forbade the persecution of all non-Muslims immediately after the restoration of peace and order in Constantinople. Then by solemn proclamation he invited all the fugitives to return to their homes, assuring them of safety and encouraging them to resume their former occupations. Constantine had alienated his subjects by conforming to the Latin Church. Muhammad gratified the Greeks, who loved their orthodoxy more than their liberty, by installing a new Patriarch at the head of the Greek Church and proclaiming himself its protector. A formal charter was afterwards granted by him which declared the person of the Greek Patriarch inviolable, and exempted him and other dignitaries of his church from all public burdens. The same document assured to the Greeks the use of their churches and the free exercise of their religious rites according to their own usages.

Gennadios, the first patriarch after the Turkish conquest, received from the hands of the Sultan himself the pastoral staff, which was the sign of his office, together with a purse of a thousand golden ducats and a horse with gorgeous trappings, on which he was privileged to ride with his train through the city. But not only was the head of the Church treated with all the respect he had been accustomed to receive from the Christian emperors, but further he was invested with extensive civil power. The patriarch's court sat to decide all cases between Greek and Greek: it could impose fines, imprison offenders in a prison provided for its own special use, and in some cases even condemn to capital punishment, while the ministers and officials of the government were directed to enforce its judgement. The complete control of spiritual and ecclesiastical matters (in which the Turkish government, unlike the civil power of the Byzantine empire never interfered), was left entirely in his hands and those of the grand synod which he could summon whenever he pleased; and hereby he could decide all matters of faith and dogma without fear of interference on the part of the state. As a recognised officer of the imperial government, he could do much for the alleviation of the oppressed, by bringing the acts of unjust governors to the notice of the Sultan. The Greek bishops in the provinces in their turn were treated with great consideration in civil affairs, so that up to modern times they have acted in their dioceses almost as if they were Ottoman prefects over the orthodox population, thus taking the place of the old Christian aristocracy which had heen exterminated by the conquerors, and we find that the higher clergy were generally more active as Turkish agents than as Greek priests, and always taught their people that the Sultan possessed a divine sanction as the protector of the Orthodox Church. A charter was subsequently published, securing to the orthodox the use of such churches as had not been confiscated to form mosques, and authorising them to celebrate their religious rites publicly according to their national usages.

Consequently, though the Greeks were numerically superior to the Turks in all the European provinces of the empire, the religious toleration thus granted them and the protection of life and property they enjoyed, soon reconciled them to the change of masters and led them to prefer the domination of the Sultan to that of any Christian power. Indeed, in many parts of the country, the Ottoman conquerers were welcomed by the Greeks as their deliverers from the rapacious and tyrannous rule of the Franks and the Venetians who had so long disputed with Byzantine for the possession of the Peloponnesos and some of the adjacent parts of Greece; by introducing into Greece the feudal system, they had reduced the people to the miserable condition of serfs, and as aliens in speech, race and creed, were hated by their subjects, to whom change of rulers, since it could not make their condition worse, would offer a possible change of improving it, and though the deliverers were likewise aliens, yet the infidel Turk was infinitely to be preferred to the heretical Catholics. The Greeks who lived under the immediate government of the Byzantine court, were equally unlikely to be averse to a change of rulers. The degradation and tyranny that characterised the dynasty of the palaeologi are frightful to contemplate. "A corrupt aristocracy, a tyrannical and innumerable clergy, the oppression of perverted law, the exactions of a despicable government, and still more, its monopolies, its fiscality, its armies of tax and custom collectors, left the degraded people neither right nor institutions, nither chance of amelioration nor hope of redress." Lest such a judgement appear dictated by a spirit of party bias, a contemporary authority may be appealed to in support of its correctness. The Russian annalists who speak of the fall of Constantinople bring a similar indictment against its government. "Without the fear of the law an empire is like a steed without reins. Constantine and his ancestors allowed their grandees to oppress the people; there was no more justice in their law courts; no more courage in their hearts; the judges amassed treasures from the tears and blood of the innocent; the Greek soldiers were proud only of the magnificence of their dress; the citizens did not blush at being traitors; the soldiers were not ashamed to fly. At length the Lord poured out His thunder on these unworthy rulers, and raised up Muhammad, whose warriors delight in battle, and whose judges do not betray their trust". This last item of praise may sound strange in the ears of a generation that has constantly been called upon to protest against Turkish injustice; but it is clearly and abundantly borne out by the testimony of contemporary historians. The Byzantine historian who has handed down to us the story of the capture of Constantinople tells us how even the impetuous Bayazid was liberal and generous to his Christian subjects and made himself extremely popular among them by admitting them freely to his society. Murad II distinguished himself by his attention to the administration of justice and his reforms of the abuses prevalent under the Greek emperors, and punished without mercy those of his officials who oppressed any of his subjects. For at least a century after the fall of Constantinople, a series of able rulers secured, by a firm and vigorous administration, peace and order throughout their dominions, and an admirable civil and judicial organisation. If it did not provide an absolutely impartial justice for Muslims and Christians alike, yet it caused the Greeks to be far better off than they had been before. They were harassed by fewer exactions of forced labour, extraordinary exactions were rarely levied. and the taxes they paid were a trifling burden compared with the endless feudal obligations of the Franks and the countless extortions of the Byzantines. The Turkish dominions were certainly better governed and more prosperous than most parts of Christian Europe, and the mass of the Christian population engaged in the cultivation of the soil enjoyed a larger measure of private liberty and the fruits of their labour under the government of the Sultan than their contemporaries did under that of many Christian monarchs.

The difference between the lot of the Riayas under their Turkish masters and that of the serfs of Christendom under their fellow Christians and fellow countrymen, who were their lords, was practically shown by the anxiety which the inhabitants near the Turkish frontier showed to escape from their homes, and live under that Turkish yoke which is frequently represented as having always been so tyrannical. "I have seen", says a writer who was Suleman's contemporary, "multitudes of Hungarian rustics set fire to their cottages, and fly with their wives and children, their cattle and instruments of labour to the Turkish territories, where they know that, besides the payment of the tenths, they would be subject to no imposts or vexations".

Whatever the political economists of the present time may think of the legislation of Suleman as to wages, manufactures and retail trade, their highest praises are due to the enlightened liberality with which the foreign merchant was welcomed in his empire. The earliest of the contracts, called capitulations, which guaranteed to the foreign merchants in Turkey full protection for person and property, the free exercise of religion and the safeguard of their own laws administered by functionaries of his own nation, was granted by Suleman to France in 1535. An extremely moderate custom duty was the only impost on foreign merchandise and the costly and vexatious system of prohibitive and protective duties has been utterly unknown among the Ottomans. No stipulation for reciprocity ever clogged the wise liberality of Turkey in her treatment of the foreign merchant who became her resident, or in the admission of his ships and goods.

A great impulse was given to the commercial activity of the country, for the early Sultans were always ready to foster trade and commerce among their subjects, and many of the great cities entered upon an era of prosperity when the Turkish conquest had delivered them from the paralysing fiscal oppression of the Byzantine empire, one of the first being Nicea which capitulated to Urkhan in 1330 under the most favourable terms after a long-protracted siege. Like the ancient Romans, the Ottomans were great makers of roads and bridges, and thereby facilitated trade throughout their empire; foreign states were compelled to admit the Greek merchants into ports from which they had been excluded in the time of the Byzantine emperors, but now sailing under the Ottoman flag, they assumed the dress and manners of Turks, and thus secured from the nations of Western Europe the respect and consideration which the Catholics had hitherto always refused to the members of the Greek Church. Antioch in the seventeenth century congratulated himself when he saw the fearful atrocities that the Catholic Poles inflicted on the Russians of the Orthodox Eastern Church: "We all wept much over the thousands of martyrs who were killed by those impious wretches, the enemies of the faith, in these forty or fifty years. The number probably amounted to seventy or eighty thousand souls. O you infidels! O you monsters of impurity! O you hearts of stone. What had the nuns and women done? What the girls and boys and infant children, that you should murder them?...And why do I pronounce them (the Poles) accursed? Because they have shown themselves more debased and wicked than the corrupt worshippers of idols, by their cruel treatment of Christians, thinking to abolish the very name of Orthodox. God perpetuate the empire of the Turks for ever and ever. For they take their impost and enter into no account of religion, be their subjects Christians or Nazarenes, Jews or Samarians: Whereas these accursed Poles were not content with taxes and tithes from the brethren of Christ, though willing to serve them; but they subjected them to the authority of the enemies of Chirst, the tyrannical Jews, who did not even permit them to build churches, nor leave them any priests that knew the mysteries of the faith." Even in Italy there were men who turned longing eyes towards the Turks in the hope that as their subjects they might enjoy the freedom and the toleration they despaired of enjoying under a Christian government.

Yet it has been said by one who was a captive among them for twenty-two years that the Turks "Compelled no one to renounce his faith." Similar testimony is borne by others, and an English gentleman who visited Turkey in the early part of the seventeenth century, tells us that "There is seldom any compulsion of conscience, and then not by death, where no criminal offence gives occasion."

Even the behaviour of the soldiery receives its meed of praise. During the march of an army the inhabitants of the country, we are told by the secretary to the Embassy sent by Charles II to the Sultan, had no complaints to make of being plundered or of their women being maltreated. All the taverns along the line of march were shut up and sealed two or three days before the arrival of the army, and no wine was allowed to be sold to the soldiers under pain of death.

Many a tribute of praise is given to the virtues of the Turks even by Christian writers who bore them no love ; one such who had a very poor opinion of their religion, speaks of them as follows : "Even in the dirt of the Alcoran you shall find some jewels of Christian Virtues ; and indeed if Christians will but diligently read and observe the Laws and Histories of the Mahometans, they may blush to see how zealous they are in the works of devotion, piety, and charity, how devout, cleanly, and reverend in their Mosques, how obedient to their priest, that even the great Turk himself will attempt nothing without consulting his Mufti : how careful are they to observe their hours of prayer five times a day wherever they are, or however employed ? How constantly do they observe their fasts from morning till night a whole month together ; how loving and charitable the Muslemans are to each other, and careful of strangers may be seen by their Hospitals, both for the poor and for Travellers ; if we observe their justice, Temperance, and other moral Virtues, we may truly blush at our own coldness, both in devotion and charity, at our injustice, intemperance, and oppression ; doubtless these Men will rise up in judgement against us ; and surely their devotion, piety, and works of mercy are main causes of the growth of Mahometism."

Further, the Christian subjects of the Turkish empire had to pay only a small tax known as Jazia for protection and in lieu of military service. The rates fixed by the Ottoman law were 2½, 5 and 10 piasters a head for every full-grown male, according to his income, women and the clergy being exempt. In the nineteenth century the rates were 15, 30 and 60 piasters, according to income. Christian writers of the sixteenth and seventeeth centuries generally speak of this tax as being a ducat a head, but it is also variously described as amounting to 3, 5 or 5 7/8 crowns or dollars. The fluctuating exchange value of the Turkish coinage in the seventeenth century is the probable explanation of the latter variations. To estimate with any exactitude how far this tax was a burden to those who had to pay it, would require a lengthened disquisition on the purchasing value of money at that period and a comparison with other items of expenditure. However, it may be surmised that it was a very light tax and was optional. If the non-Muslims were willing to render military service they could be exempted from this tax.

The land taxes were the same both for Christians and Musalmans, for the old distinction between lands on which *ushr* was paid by the Muslim proprietor, and those on which *kharaj* was not recognised by the Ottomans.

The treatment of their Christian subjects by the Ottoman emperors—at least for two centuries after their conquest of Greece—exhibits such a toleration as was at that time quite unknown in the rest of Europe. The Calvinists of Hungary and Transylvania, and the Unitarians of the latter country, long preferred to submit to the Turks rather than fall into the hands of the fanatical house of Hapsburg, and the Protestants of Silesia looked with longing eyes towards Turkey, and would gladly have purchased religious freedom at the price of submission to the Muslim rule. It was to Turkey that the persecuted Spanish Jews fled for refuge in enormous numbers at the end of the fifteenth century and the Cossacks who belonged to the sect of the Old Believers and were persecuted by the Russian State Church, found in the dominions of the Sultan the toleration which their Christian brethren denied them. Well might the Patriarch Macarus say, "Even slaves under Turkish regime were much better than under Christian rulers."

As organised by the Muhammadan law, slavery was robbed of many of its harshest features, nor in Turkey at least does it seem to have been accompanied by such barbarities and atrocities as in the pirate states of Northern Africa. The slaves, like other citizens, had their rights, and it is even said that a slave might summon his master before the *Qadi* for ill usage, and that if he alleged that their tempers were so opposite that it was impossible for them to agree, the *Qadi* could oblige his master to sell him. The condition of the Christian captives naturally varied with circumstances and their own capabilities of adapting themselves to a life of hardship; the aged, the priests and monks, and those of noble birth suffered most, while the physician and the handicraftsman received more considerate treatment from their masters, as being servants that best repaid the money spent upon them. The galley-slaves naturally suffered most of all; indeed the kindest treatment could have but little relieved the hardships incident to such an occupation. Further, the lot of the slaves who were state property was more pitiable than that of those who had been purchased by private individuals. As a rule they were allowed the free exercise of their religion in the state prisons at Constantinople. They had their own priests and chapels, and the clergy were allowed to administer the consolations of religion to the galley-slaves.

In the end it may be concluded that the Turkish rulers were as liberal in their treatment towards the non-Muslims as their counterparts in the East had been; they also committed the same blunder which was committed by the Muslim rulers of India that they vitiated the ideology of Islam by introducing the same undefined system of hereditary succession on the one hand, and through their negligence towards *Tabligh* on the other and remained in minority in all their European territories. Moreover, they had shown such generons treatment towards their Christian subjects and had given them an autonomy in every field that made them a powerful section of the population. And when the Christian Rulers of the West were in a position to give them the same treatment it was but natural for them to assert their own independence. Thus the generous treatment without the accompaniment of *Tabligh* brought about the decline of the Turkish Empire.

PART II

Muslims Under Non-Muslim Rule

Muslims in Spain

In the last seven chapters, I have dealt with the treatment meted out to non-Muslim subjects by their Muslim rulers from the time of the Holy Prophet down to the Turkish period. From the beginning of the eighteenth century, the decline of the Muslim power both in the East and West began to set in and during the course of it almost all Muslim kingdoms came under the domination of foreign powers. The causes of decline were almost the same in all of them—an undefined system of hereditary succession which led to wars of succession among various competitors, degeneration among the rulers, indifference to the promotion of the cause of Islam, unequal treatment to the new converts, mutual tribal rivalries and generous treatment to the non-Muslim minorities. So long as the Muslim rulers were strong, they kept themselves within the bound of Sharia and promulgated it within the sphere of their influence, the minorities remained loyal as they could not be given the same liberal treatment by their own non-Muslim rulers. On the one hand owing to deviations from the fundamental principles of Islam and the incapacity of the rulers, the central authority of these kingdoms got weakened with the result that the provincial governors tried to become independent; and on the other these minorities, on account of their cultural and religious autonomy, became too powerful to be controlled by weak rulers. Moreover, after a long slumber of centuries, Europe woke up on account of its contact with the Muslims through Spain and Sicily and the wave of Renaissance started there. When Europe became conscious of those Islamic values which had enabled them to be the leaders of thought and action for centuries, it began to adopt them. When Christian rulers began to accord the same generous treatment to their own subjects, there was no justification for these Muslim rulers to expect the same loyalty from their erstwhile subjects. All these factors combined to bring about the rapid disintegration of the Muslim Empire.

When Muslims came under foreign rule, in some places they were completely annihilated and eliminated, or forcibly converted to Christianity, and in others their culture was merged into that of the ruling class under the cloak of national integration. However, after being ruthlessly persecuted for about two centuries, the Muslims have been able to become independent only in those areas where they happened to be in majority, under the principle of self-determination.

Hence the topic of the second part of this book is to show how the Muslims who had given such unparalleled liberal treatment to their non-Muslim subjects, were treated by their non-Muslim rulers when they assumed the position of a subject race.

Let us begin first with the Muslims of Spain who were the first to lose their kingdom and became enslaved to their erstwhile Christian subjects.

In one of the previous chapters in the first part of the book we have already dealt with the generous treatment meted out to these Christian subjects by the Muslim rulers in Spain. On the other hand, they adopted a wise and liberal administration, which benefitted Spain so much that it became the leading country of Europe. It is asserted by a European historian that the prosperity of this country can be imagined well from the fact that its revenues exceededthe combined revenues of the whole of Europe. As to the literary and cultural achievements of the Muslims in Spain, in contrast to Europeans, let me quote the great historian Draper in his excellent work entitled "The Intellectual Development of Europe." Turning his narrative to Muslim Spain, he writes:—

"At the time of Muslim conquest, Spain and its people were so degenerate that they had lost all power of resistance and if the Muslims had taken it into their head to annihilate or eliminate, they could have done it easily, and not a single Christian or Jew could have been left. But Muslims being unbiased by their faith could not do so.

"From the barbarism of the people of Europe, who could scarcely be said to have emerged from the savage state, unclean in person, benighted in mind, inhabiting huts in which it was a mark of wealth if there were bulrushes on the floor and straw mats against the wall; miserably fed on beans, vetches, roots, even the bark of trees; clad in garments of untanned skin, or at the best of leather of perennial durability, but not conducive to purity—a state in which the pomp of royalty was sufficiently and satisfactorily manifested in the equipage of the sovereign, an ox cart, drawn by not less than two yoke of cattle, quickened in their movements by the goods of pedestrian serfs, whose legs were wrapped in the wisps of straws; from a people, devout believers in all the wild fictions of shrine miracle and preposterous relics, from the degradation of a base theology, and from the disputes of ambitious ecclesiasts for power, it is pleasant to turn to the south west corner of the continent, where under auspices of a very different kind, the irradiations of light were to break forth."

It is well known that Cordova, the Andalusian metropolis, had reached the zenith of culture and civilization. It had seventy libraries and nine hundred baths in a population of about one million. Its advanced stage of development is well illustrated by the fact that after sunset a man might walk through Cordova in a straight line for ten miles by the light of public lamps. Even hundred years after this time there was not so much as one public lamp in London. The streets of Cordova were solidly paved. In Paris, centuries subsequently whoever stepped over his threshold on a rainy day stepped upto his ankles in mud.

Now let us see what reward the Muslims received at the hands of their Christian overlords when they became enslaved to them after the fall of Granada in 1491.

On the 25th of November, 1491, the act of capitulation was signed, and a term was fixed during which a truce was to be observed, after which, should no aid come from outside, Granada was to be delivered up to their Catholic Majesties. In vain the Muslims watched for a sign of the help they had sought from the sultans of Turkey and Egypt. No aid came, and at the end of December, Boabdil, the king of Granada, sent a message to Ferdinand to come and take possession of the city. Thus the Christian army entered

Alhambra, and presently the great silver cross was seen shining from the summit of the Toree dela Vela ; beside it floated the banner of St. James, while shouts of 'Santiago' rose from the army in the plain beneath ; and lastly, the standard of Castle of Aragon was planted by the side of the cross. The royal choir sang a solemn Te Deum.

At first, indeed, it seemed as if the equitable terms upon which Granada had capitulated would be observed, and freedom of worship and the Islamic law would be allowed to be practised by the Muslims. The first archbishop, Ibrnandao de Talavera, was a good and liberal-minded man, and did not believe in forcible conversion. He tried to win the Muslims over to his faith by force of example by uniform justice and kindness, and by conforming as far as possible to their ways. He made his priests learn Arabic and said his prayers in Arabic ; by such concession, he wanted to achieve his objects. But Cardinal Ximenes who was sent by Queen Isabella to assist in this mission was little in harmony with the Archbishop's soft ways : he was the apostle of the Church Militant ; always most active when militant meant triumphant, and would have the souls of these infidels saved from hell fire whether they liked it or not. He insinuated in Isabella's holy mind the pernicious doctrine that to keep faith with infidels was breaking faith with God ; and thus made her agreeable to the persecution of the Moors or Moriscos as they now began to be called.

The first attempt to coerce the Muslims was a failure. Some of the straiter Muslims expressed their repugnance to forcible conversion to Christianity. These malcontents were arrested. Muslims, being held in prison on such a pretext roused the public which rose in arms and rescued them, and Granada was filled with uproar and barricade fights. The garrison was hopelessly outnumbered. Ximenes raged with impotent fury but the peaceful archbishop pacified the infuriated populace. The disputes were composed temporarily and the Cardinal had to retire.

Ximenes was, however, too hot a man to be easily deterred from his purpose. He prevailed upon the queen to promulgate a decree by which the Moors were given the choice of baptism or exile. They were reminded that their ancestors had once been

Christians, and that by descent they themselves were born in the Church, and must naturally profess its doctrines. The mosques were closed, countless manuscripts containing the results of ages of Moorish learning were burnt by the orders of the ruthless Cardinal, and the unhappy 'infidels' were threatened and beaten into the Gospel of Peace and Goodwill after the manner already approved by their Cardinal Majesties in respect of the no less miserable Jews. Some of the Muslims apparently embraced Christianity in order to avoid persecution and securing their homes but the spark among the hillmen of the Alpuxarras flickered, who for some time held their snowy fastnesses against their persecutors. The first effort on the part of the Christians ended in disaster.

This temporary success of the Moors, however, only aggravated the reprisals of the now exasperated Christians. The Count of Tendilla stormed Guejar ; the Count of Sorin blew up the mosque in which the women and children of a wide district had been placed for safety, and King Ferdinand himself seized the key of the passes to the Castle of Lanjaron. The remnant of the rebels fled to Morocco Egypt, and Turkey where their skill as artificers secured them a living. Thus the first revolt in the Alpuxarras was suppressed.

Half a century of smouldering hatred ensued. The Moriscos grudgingly fulfilled the minimum of religious duties imposed on them by their outward conversion ; but they took care to wash off the holy water with which their children were baptized as soon as they were out of the priests' sight. They came home from their Christian weddings to be married again after the Islamic rite ; and they made the Barbary corsair at home in their cities and helped him to kidnap the children of the Christians.

A wise and honest government, respecting its pledges given at the time of the surrender of Granada, would have been spared the dangers of this hidden disaffection ; but the rules of Spain were neither wise nor honest in their dealings with the Moriscos, and as time went on they became more and more cruel and false. The 'infidels' were ordered to abandon their native and picturesque costume, and to wear the hats and breeches of the Christians ; to give up bathing, and adopt the dirt of their conquerors; to renounce their language, their customs and ceremonies, even their very names, and to speak Spanish, behave like Spaniards and adopt Spanish names. The great Emperor Charles V sanctioned this monstrous decree in 1526, but he had the sense not to enforce it strictly ; and his agents used it only as a means of extorting bribes from the helpless Moors as the price of official blindness. The Inquisition was satisfied for the time being with a "traffic in toleration" which filled the coffers of the State treasury. However, it was left to Philip II to carry into practical effect the tyrannical law which his father had promulgated. In 1567 he enforced the odious regulations about language, customs, and the like, and to secure the validity of the prohibition of cleanliness began by pulling down the beautiful baths of the Alhambra. The wholesale denationalization of the people was more than the successors of Abdur Rahman could stomach. A small incident with some plundering tax-gatherers set light to the inflammable material which had long been smouldering ; some soldiers were murdered by peasants in whose huts they were billeted ; and in a week the whole of the Alpuxarras was in arms, and the second Morisco rebellion began in 1568.

The great rebellion in the Alpuxarras lasted for two years, and its repression called forth the utmost energy of the Spaniards. The struggle was fierce and desperate ; it was the Moor's last stand ; they felt themselves at bay, and avenged in their first mad rush of fury a hundred years of insult and persecution.

The Marquess of Mondejar, who commanded at Granada, endeavoured by conciliation and generosity to calm the rebels whom his resolute march into the mountains at the head of four thousand men had to a great extent suppressed; but an accidental massacre at Jubiles and an act of treachery at Larole, rekindled the flame of revolt which had been partly extinguished ; and the ruthless murder of one hundred and ten Moriscos by their Christian fellow prisoners in the jail of the Alabaycin still further exasperated the persecuted Muslims.

The king's half brother, Don John of Austria, a yong man of twenty-two, but full of promise, superseded Mondejar as Commander in chief against the Moriscos, and after a protracted correspondence, he was able to convince Philip of the gravity of the situation and the necessity for strong military action. At last Don John received his marching orders, and after that, it was but a short shrive that the Moriscos could expect. In the winter of 1569-70 he began his campaign, and in May the terms of surrender had been arranged. Ion motto gave 'no quarter'; men women, and children were butchered by his order and under his own eye ; the villages of the Alpuxarras were turned into human shambles. The Moriscos were at last subdued, at the cost of the honour, and with the loss of the future, of Christian Spain.

Slavery and exile awaited the survivors of the rebellion. They were not very many. The late wars, it was said, had carried off more than twenty thousand Moors, and perhaps fifty thousand remained in the district on the famous Day of All Saints, 1570 when the honour of the apostles and martyrs of Christendom was celebrated by the virtual martyrdom of the poor remnant of the Moors. Those taken in open revolt were enslaved, and the rest were banished. Many hapless exiles died on the way from want, fatigue and exposure ; others reached Africa, where they might beg a daily pittance. The deportation was not finished till 1610, when half a million of Moriscos were exiled and ruined. It is stated that no less than three million of Moors were banished between the fall of Granada and the first decade of the seventeenth century.

The misguided Spaniards knew not what they were doing. The exile of the Moors delighted them ; nothing more picturesque and romantic had occurred for some time. They did not understand that they had killed their golden goose. For centuries Spain had been the centre of civilization, the seat of arts and sciences, of learning and every form of refined enlightenment. No other country in Europe had so far approached the cultivated dominion of the Moors. The brief brilliancy of Ferdinand and Isabella, and of the empire of Charles VI, could found no such enduring pre-eminence. In the words of Lane Poole, the famous historian, "The Moors were banished ; for a while Christian Spain shone, like the moon, with a borrowed light ; then came the eclipse, and in that darkness Spain has grovelled ever since. The true memorial of the Moors is seen in desolate tracts of utter barrenness, where once the Muslims grew luxuriant vines and olives and yellow ears of corn ; in a stupid, ignorant population where once wit and learning flourished ; in the general stagnation and degradation of a people which has hopelessly fallen in the scale of the nations, and has deserved its humiliation."

Muslims in China

The New Tang History records that the first Muslim mission to China arrived at the court in 651 A. D. This new religion which belonged to the Sunnite Sect was brought into China by Arab diplomats, merchants, artists and scholars. In the beginning it was foreigners, not Chinese, who practised this faith.

Islam began to be established on a larger scale on Chinese territory by several thousand Arab scholars who settled down in the North-West after having helped the Tang troops to put down the rebellions started by one Lu-Shan. At the beginning of the 9th century, Islam penetrated into the South-west and the Muslim soldiers settled in the present Yunnan Province. In the 13th century they were augmented by many Arab and Tartar invaders who came into Yunnan with the Mongols. At the same time the so-called Semu people, the majority of whom were Muslims, began to settle down as permanent residents in all the important cities and towns in China proper. Many of them served in the armies, others held important posts in the local civil governments, and the rest were traders. Islam was also firmly established in Canton, Ch'uancheous, Hangchou and Yangchou during the T'ang-Sung Yuan times (618-906/960-1297 and 12 1280-1367 A. D. respectively). In these coastal cities there were large Arab and Persian Muslim communities which had their own living quarters, mosques and trading centres. Although Chinese Muslims, became Sinicized in the course of time through intermarriage and adoption of Chinese customs, still they have remained not only a religious group but also an ethnic minority.

Muslim communities in T'ang Sung times were wealthy and prosperous. During the Uan-Ming period, many Muslim leaders held high positions in the government, while majority of the Muslim people were engaged in trade, commerce, agriculture and pasturage. They enjoyed a peaceful life. This was the golden period of Chinese Islam, which ended with the Manchu rule of China. This golden age lasted almost one millenium, 651-1648. During these years, the Muslims never revolted against any ruling house of Government and fulfilled their duties as loyal subjects in the same manner as the other people of China. But after the downfall of the Ming dynasty, owing to a policy of racial discrimination and political suppression by the Manchu and Han authorities, the Muslims in Shensi, Kansu, Yunnan, and Sinkiang provinces staged at least ten important rebellions between 1618 and 1878 A. D. It is claimed that as many as 10,000,000 Muslims were killed as a result of these upheavals. The establishment of the Republic of China in 1912, however, promised new hope for the Muslim minority.

Although Chinese Muslims were persecuted by the Manchus and Hans, there was at the same time a renaissance movement under way. It was begun by Chang Chung, Ma Chu and Liu Chih who were Muslim leaders and scholars of the 17th century. In order to educate the Muslim community and to introduce Islam to the Chinese they translated the Quran and the Traditions of the Holy Prophet.

However, despite all efforts to build up an understanding between the Muslims and the Hans, persecution by the Manchu Government and rebellions by the Muslims did not come to an end.

This unsuccessful renaissance movement entered a new stage in the 20th century. This Islamic revival actually began in 1903, when the first Arabic Normal Institute and the first Muslim primary school were established in Peking. For the first time, the Chinese language and Western science as well as Islamic literature were taught. The religious and educational modernization was primarily due to the efforts of Haji Sheikh Abdul Rahman Wang Hao-jen (1858-1919 A. D.), the best known and influential Imam or Ahung of Peking at that time.

Islam Under the Nationalist Government

In 1912, the Republic of China recognized the Chinese Muslims as the Hui race, which was one of the five races comprising the Republic—the Hans, Manchus, Mongols, Muslims and Tibetans. This racial policy was in agreement with the Doctrine of Nationalism of Dr. Sun Yat-Sen. With this new status, the Muslims became very enthusiastic in pushing forward their revival movement and expanding their activities into many fields.

The first thing they accomplished was the founding of the Chinese Muslim General Advance Association in 1912, which was the first Islamic national organization in Chinese history. Within a few years, it had two thousand branches throughout the country. Each branch usually established a primary school for both boys and girls. Newspapers and religious periodicals, together with translation of the Quran, inspired many brilliant scholars with leadership and wisdom of Sheikh Abdul-Rahman.

Spiritually and personally influenced by Abd al-Hamid II, the 36th Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, the Chinese Sheikh also preached Pan-Islamism in China. Although this movement had a great impact on the attitude and activities of many of the younger Chinese Muslim leaders, the majority of the Islamic community was primarily concerned with causes of the Chinese Republic. For example, a great accomplishment of the Peking and Nanking Muslims was their response in 1911 to the call of Dr. San Yat-Sen by persuading the various petty kings in Sinkiang and the leading generals in Kansu to pledge loyalty to the new government and to stand against the Manchus.

The Role of Chinese Muslims in Nationalist China (1928)

China was unified by the Nationalists in 1928, when the Northern Expeditionary forces reached Peking under the command of General Omar Pai Ch'unghsi (1893), an Arab descendant. He is not only a well-known military strategist, but also an ardent Muslim leader who has earned great respect from the Islamic World.

Like Omar Pai, all the Muslim political and military leaders in the North-west, such as Ma Fu-hsiang (d. 1932) and Ma Ch'i were staunch supporters of the Nationalist government in the cause of unification. The unanimous stand of the twenty-six Muslim generals may have been one of the main factors in the release of Generalismo Chiang-Kai-Shek after the 1936 Sian Coup.

During the Sino-Japanese war (1937-1945) Chinese Muslims in the North-west stood by the Nationalist government and helped in preventing Japan from cutting into Sinkiang. On the religious front four Chinese Muslim goodwill missions were organized during 1938-1940. They travelled through the Middle East and South-east Asia, and won the sympathies of the believers for the Chinese against Japanese, particularly in the Arab World and India.

As a gesture of good-will towards the Muslims, the Constitution of the Republic of China recognised the representation of the Muslims for the first time. According to Article 135 of the Constitution, which reads: "The number of Delegates to the National Assembly and the manner of their election from people in interior areas, who have their own conditions of living and habits, shall be prescribed by law," seventeen Chinese Muslims were elected as delegates in November 1947. This was the first time in Chinese history that the Muslims were officially represented in the government, although their ratio was unreasonably low in comparison with that of the Hans.

In 1949, only about 40,000 Chinese Muslims escaped to Taiwan. They preserved Islamic traditions, customs and ceremonies as usual, and have formed the nucleus of Chinese Islam in Taipie. In 1960, they built a new mosque where the Chinese National Muslim League is located. The League sends delegations every year to make a pilgrimage to Mecca and to attend the Islamic World Annual Conference at the same time. In 1958, a translation of the Quran into modern Chinese was published by Haji Shih Tzu-Chou, the president of the League. Since 1952, a monthly paper in Chinese has been published by the League.

From the Taipie Muslim Centre, the preaching movement extended into Malaysia, directed by Haji Ibrahim T.Y. Ma, to spread Islam among the overseas Chinese there. During the past ten years, about 3500 Chinese, formerly Buddhists or Confucians have been converted to Islam. Consequently, their relations with the local Malaysian Muslims have improved much.

But the revival movement ended with the victory of Communism on the mainland, and the efforts of the Taiwan Muslims seem to be directed toward bringing about a second Islamic revival in China.

Islam Under Communist Government

The Chinese Muslims have in the past cooperated with any dynasty or government as long as they were allowed religious freedom. Muslim generals led their troops in many battles against the Red army and scored at least four big victories during 1935-1947 in Kansu, Nighsia and Shensi. But when the Nationalists lost the war against the Communists, the Muslims also had to surrender the Northwest. But as early as 1936, Mao Tse-tung formed a provisional Muslim Soviet Government in the Northwest and even recruited whole regiments of Muslims, granting them full freedom of religion. Since then the Muslims living in the occupied areas have been influenced by the Communists. Their cooperative attitude, however, did not change their religious faith. Concerning the Muslim Communist students and soldiers whom she had met in Kansu in 1937, Nym Wales says, "Although the Mohammedans of China are much less fanatical than those in Islam proper, these believers in Allah were still loyal even after inoculation with the virus of Marxism," and "They were prepared to march under the Red Star and the Crescent, but had not yet embroidered the name 'Karl Marx' on their prayer rugs."

Since early years of the growth of Communism in China, Muslims have been active in the party. In 1938, about 2,000 Hopei Muslims organized themselves into a special detachment and joined the eighth Route Red Army. This unit attained fame by annihilating about 1,000 Japanese soldiers of the Yamaoto Regiment in 1941. In 1944, the Sinkiang Muslims took up arms against the Nationalist troops in cooperation with the communists. Similar groups were formed among the Muslims in other parts of China during the anti-Japanese war.

On the religious and political front, many famous Chinese Muslim Ahungs, scholars and statesmen, who had worked in or cooperated with the Nationalist government before 1949, are now holding important posts in Communist China. In 1953, the China Islamic Association, a National organization, was established. It has recently issued two editions of the Quran and an annual called Chinese Moslems in Progress (or Moslems in China). Since 1955 the Association has been deputing pilgrimage mission to Mecca every year. In the same year, the Chinese Islamic Institute, the highest institution of Islamic students in China, was founded. According to its reports, the mosques, numbering more than 40,000 in China seem to have been maintained in good condition. By 1957, twenty-four Muslim-inhabited autonomous areas were set up. Although the Muslims constitute only 1.66% of China's population, they were represented by forty-one deputies, or 3.34% of the total in the First National People's Congress.

But available information suggests that the situation of Islam in Communist China is not uniformly bright. Since 1949, many mosques in rural areas have been used for other purposes, such as slaughter-houses; the use of old text-books on Islam has not been allowed in the Agrarian Reform Work Corps, assisting Muslim peasants in their struggle against the landlord class, or otherwise be replaced by Communist-trained Muslim cadres. All the Ahungs also have been forced to interpret the Quran from the Marxist-Leninist point of view, and numerous Muslim youths working in producing centres have been compelled to take the same meals as non-Muslims.

The Communists seem to be tolerant towards Islam in leading cities, possibly for the purpose of demonstrating to visitors from the Islamic World that Islam can co-exist with Communism in China. But their policy is less tolerant in the rural areas or in small towns.

Nationalist Vs. Communist Policies Towards Islam

Nationalist and Communist policies towards Islam differ on several important points. Ethnic solidarity and religious faith are the two fundamental characteristics of the Muslim community in China. The lack of either one of them would mean the dissolution of Chinese Islam.

During the years 1928-1945, the Nationalists, based upon the Doctrine of Nationalism of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, insisted that most of the Muslims were of Chinese stock who embraced the Islamic faith and differed only in habits, customs and religious bliefs from the other Chinese. In other words, the Chinese Muslims only formed a religious group. However, this policy began to have a moderate change in 1946 and its spirit had almost completely changed in 1954.

It was on Dec. 25, 1946 that Article 135 of the Constitution of the Republic of China, adopted by the National Assembly in Nanking, changed the Muslim status from "Chinese stock who embraced the Islamic faith" to the "people in interior areas, who have their own conditions of living and habits." Although this new definition did not openly recognize the Muslims as an ethnic minority it indicated that the Nationalists were coming to realize that the Muslims are different from the Han Chinese in religion, in living and in habits.

Eight years later, the National Assembly passed a revised bill on March 18, 1954, prescribing that those who embrace the Islamic faith should be called the "Hui Min", i.e. the Muslims, instead of the "people in interior areas, who have their own conditions of living and habits." This amendment to Article 135 of the Constitution of the Republic of China clearly shows that the Nationalist government has officially recognized the Chinese Muslims not only as a religious group but also as an ethnic minority.

Communist Attitude

The Chinese Communists, from the beginning, considered the Muslims comprising ten racial minorities as ethnic groups, and only purely religious minorities. They attack the Nationalists by claiming that the Kumintang government is trying to establish "Greater Hanism" in the country and attempting to Sinicize the Muslims and integrate them with the Hans.

The Communists are trying to minimize the value of religion, which, based upon their doctrines, must unavoidably be eliminated with the development of the proletarian revolution. But they are trying to maximize the value of nationalities because their New Social Order is built upon the mobilized manpower of all the nationalities. However, it seems that this Communist policy will not affect the attitude of the Muslims towards Islam at all. The Muslim minorities derive their solidarity equally from blood relations and religious belief. Without Islam as their religion, they will remain an ethnic groups but will no longer be called Muslim majorities. So long as the Communists do not decid to deprive the Muslims of their traditional name, Hui Min (Muslims) or Hui Tru (Muslim nationality), the believers of Islam in China will continue to be an ethnic group as well as a religious minority.

According to the 1938 Nationalist estimates, there were 42,371 mosques in China among the 48,104,240 Muslims. For every 1,133 Muslims there was a mosque. According to the 1952 Communist estimates, although the Muslim population arbitrarily has been reduced to 10,000,000, the total number of the mosques on the mainland was still more than 40,000, i.e. one mosque for every 250 Muslims. Traditionally, mosques in China are built by the Muslims in localities by demand, and are run and financed by the local resident Muslims. Conservatively speaking, a mosque could not be built and maintained by less than 500 Muslims in one locality. For instance, right now there are only 42 mosques among a population of 80,000 Muslims in Peking. Each mosque has, averagely, 2,000 Muslims under its religious jurisdiction. Taking a conservative estimate and the Peking figure into consideration the total Muslim population now on Chinese mainland should be between 20,000,000 and 30,000,000.

The exaggeration made by the Nationalist government does not hurt its racial policy because it aims at assimilating the Muslims into the "Greater Han Race". The minimized figure made by the Communist government supports its policy "to divide and rule", reducing the importance of religious groups among the minorities.

In the 20th century Islam in China has at least three features that both the Nationalist and the Communist governments could not afford to neglect, but try to utilize. First, Chinese Muslims have now built up wider and closer contacts with the entire Islamic world whose friendship both governments have been doing their best to woo. Second, as Chinese Muslims are important racial minorities occupying strategic areas in the North-west and the South-west the value of Chinese Islam is greater to the Communists than to the Nationalists. Third, the Chinese Muslims are a disciplined and hard-working people who can offer substantial manpower to the state. These three features have been known to both the Nationalists and Communists but they have never been fully utilized for the advantage of the state until the China mainland began to be ruled by the latter in 1949.

In order to dissipate the fear of the Muslims that Islam would be eliminated in China sooner or later, the Chinese Communists from the beginning have treated them much better than they have treated the Buddhists, Christians and Taoists. If the information from the China Islamic Association Peking can be trusted, the mosques, at least in leading cities have been allowed to retain the land they had owned before 1940. The customs and habits of the Muslims are also protected by law. Many of the famous mosques in China which have historical value, have been repaired by the Communist regime. The circulation of the Quran to the mosques has been aided by the Communist officials. Undoubtedty, all the travelling expenses of the Haji missions that have been sent to Mecca are paid by the government treasury. As a result of these political expediencies, the Chinese Muslims have also done their best to speak for Communist China at home and abroad, in order to win the friendship of the Muslim World. By doing this, the Muslims hope, on the one hand, to obtain better treatment by the Communists, and on the other, to safeguard Islam as a free religion in China.

Now let us turn our attention to the condition of Muslims who inhabit Eastern Turkistan.

Eastern Turkistan is situated between 74 and 96 degrees longitude and 35 and 49 degrees latitude in the centre of the continent of Asia. Out of the total population of 8,400,000, 310,000 are Chinese colonists, 36,000 Mongols, 30,000 Manchu and the remaining 8,000,000 are Turk Muslims, who are the real owners of the country, Islam dawned in Eastern Turkistan towards the end of the second century Hijra. Eastern Turkistan accepted Islam peacefully through the influence of unity of language, culture and historical background which Eastern Turkistan had with Western Turkistan.

Eastern Turkistan and China :- Amursana of Kalmuk dynasty, who ruled Eastern Turkistan from 1670 to 1760, sought help from the Chinese Emperor to fight against his rivals. Two Chinese armies entered Eastern Turkistan, one in 1755 and another in 1757. The Chinese army easily conquered regions under Kalmuk influence, but in Altishaher (Tarim Basin) this army was met with most violent resistance by Yunus Khawaja and his son, Jehan Khawaja, who had declared independence from Kalmuk rule in the south. The Chinese captured Altishaher when Yunus Khawaja and his son, with all their soldiers, were martyred fighting in defence of their home against the Chinese aggressors. After one year the entire Chinese army was detroyed by national rebels. The second Chinese army which invaded in 1757 received constant reinforcements and massacred the people as they advanced. It has been established by official documents that by 1759 more than 1,200,000 men and women were killed by the Chinese soldiers. It was only with such savagery and brutality that the Chinese could conquer Eastern Turkistan in 1760. The patriots who took asylum in Afghanistan and Western Turkistan requested the rulers of Afghanistan, Bukhara, Fargana, Khive and Badakhshan for help. They all agreed to form an army for the rescue of Eastern Turkistan under the command of the Afghan ruler, Ahmad Shah Durrani. Accordingly, Ahmad Shah proceeded to Western Turkistan. In the meantime Eastern Turkistanis, who had received news of the holy alliance, staged a revolt known as "The revolt of Uchtorfan of 1767." Unfortunately, before the people of Eastern Turkistan could avail themselves of the assistance of the allies, the alliance was broken due to opposition of the rulers of Bukhara and Badakhshan to Ahmed Shah. Therefore the helpless people were crushed.

After this tragic event Turkistanis could do nothing but stage uprisings on small scale here and there till 1818, when a mass rebellion took place. The country attained freedom in 1822 under the leadership of Jehangir Khawaja. China attacked Eastern Turkistan again in 1826. This time the Chinese forces obtained the help of local traitors and succeeded in capturing Jehangir Khawaja and dispersing his army. Jehangir Khawaja was taken to Peipin and martyred there by the order of the Chinese Emperor. From 1834 to 1868 there was continuous resistance. The western region of Eastern Turkistan was liberated and lost six times. At last in1863 the strange for freedom spread throughout the country and won to this nation its cherished goal. Independent Eastern Turkistan was recognized by Turkey, Great Britain and Russia. The untimely death of King Yaqoob Baig and the struggle for power among Yaqoob Baig's sons and commanders shortened the life of this state. China invaded in 1878 and occupied the country again.

Local uprisings continued in various localities and were suppressed readily by the Chinese troops. In the general revolt, touched off throughout the country in 1931, the partriots completely crushed the Chinese occupation army. The Islamic Republic of Eastern Turkistan was declared established in 1933. The Chinese forces were besieged in Urumchi and the Chinese Government being quite helpless was not in a position to reinforce the besieged Chinese.

The Communist Russian Imperialists who claimed "to help liberate nations oppressed by colonialists", took the patriots by surprise and stabbed them in the back at a time when they had almost got rid of the colonialist aggressor. She strangled the national freedom in its infancy lest it should grow strong and become a source of moral inspiration for the Turk Muslim countries to the West.

Russia offered military support to the Chinese Nationalist Government, which Marshal Chiang Kaishek accepted with gratitude. In return he gave large concessions to Russia in Eastern Turkistan. Most of our Mujahidin, with primitive arms, were butchered fighting against the modern Russian army equipped with tanks and aeroplanes. This short-lived freedom, which cost the patriots 80,000 souls, came to an end. The end of 1934 marked the beginning of Russian supremacy in Eastern Turkistan. Administration was run by a semi-Communist government, headed by

Chinese Governor General, Shing-Shi-Tsai. Actually, power rested with the so-called Russian advisors. As a step towards annexation of Eastern Turkistan and establishment of Communist regime, the economy of the country was brought under control. As elements of possible opposition and resistance half a million persons were picked up among nationalists, the religious section, and persons of influence. 200,000 of them were put to death under most severe torture and atrocities unknown in human history.

There have been occasional uprisings in various parts of the country which were suppressed immediately by the Chinese garrisons asssisted by Russian troops. The most violent of them were the two uprisings in Tarim Basin and Ili in 1937, which promised liberty to the nation. In both cases the Russian might crushed the freedom lovers.

During World War II, when Germans had advanced to the gates of Moscow, the Chinese Nationalist Government availed itself of the opportunity to demand evacuation of the Russian forces from Eastern Turkistan. Russians withdrew after demolishing all army installations, factories, oil wells, and ammunition factories, which they had built up. Chinese Nationlist troops replaced the Russian forces. Chiang-Kai-Shek appointed a new Governor General who set out to run the administration in the traditional method of Chinese warlords in Eastern Turkistan, viz., creating hatred among different communities of the population and suppressing the intelligentsia. Hatred and frustration prevailed all over the country. At last there was the popular rebellion of 1944, called the Ili Rebellion. Unlike the past, this time the Russians were on the side of the patriots and supplied them with arms and ammunition. China's Army was knocked out. Probably to avoid possible complications at the theatre of International Politics, Russia offered her good offices to establish peace. There could be no better chance for Chiang Kai-Shek to save his prestige. The Russian offer for mediation was accepted and peace agreement was concluded in 1946. Under this agreement the sovereignty of the Chinese Republic over Eastern Turkistan was recognised and formation of a representative provincial government was promised. Accordingly, a coalition Government was formod in which there were ten Chinese, fifteen Eastern Turkistanis, and eight out of fifteen indigenous members were Russian agents imposed on the Chinese government. In fact the anti-Communist pro-independence group consisting of seven members was the real representative element in the government. The patriots continued their struggle against the pro-Chinese and pro-Russian groups simultaneously, until early in 1949, when Chiang Kai-Shek, as an indication of appeasement of the Soviet Union in respect of this policy towards Eastern Turkistan, deposed Mr. M. Sabri, pro-independence Governor General and appointed pro-Russian Burhan Shahidi in his place. The Chinese Communist forces occupied Eastern Turkistan in November 1949.

On 25th September, 1949 Eastern Turkistan went under combined Communist Chinese and Russian sway following the surrender of the Chinese garrison in that country. National resistance in one form or the other is still going on. Most violent battles of resistance were fought between 1950 and 1952. The extent of brutality and ruthlessness of the Chinese Communists and their Russian genocide experts has been publicly announced on Urumchi Radio by Burhan Shahidi, the then Governor General, in his 1952 New Year message. He told that during 1950-1951 campaign against "reactionaries" 122,000 muslims had been murdered.

Chinese Communist oppression in Eastern Turkistan is similar to Russian atrocities in Western Turkistan, except that mass migration of Chinese settlers to Eastern Turkistan has been extremely tragic. During the last few years 2,000,000 Chinese have been brought to settle in Eastern Turkistan. Lands and other properties confiscated from the indigenous population under land reform and other pretexts have been allotted to them.

According to information received from reliable sources from Peking it is understood that the Chinese Communist regime is working on a project to settle another 10,000,000 Chinese in Eastern Turkistan.

The people of Eastern Turkistan have been resisting Chinese policy with arms and fists. This is being confirmed by Chinese

Radio and Press. According to a broadcast from the Communist controlled radio at Urumchi, the provincial capital, the youth of Eastern Turkistan have been intensifying their struggle for freedom.

THE FUTURE OF ISLAM IN CHINA

There is no problem with Islam under the Nationalist government. But as to how long the Muslims in Communist China will happily sit on the lap of their "Godmother", is really a big question. It seems that as long as the Muslim World is strong enough to play politics between the East and the West, and as long as the Asian-African Muslim nations posses the "surplus values" that attract the wooing of communist China, and as long as the Muslim "Shahda" i.e. "There is no god except Allah ; Muhammed is his Prophet," "has not been supplanted by the Communist profession of faith as quoted by Prof. Wilfred Cantwell Smith, "There is no god, but Karl Marx is his Prophet", Islam will be respected and its believers will be tolerantly treated by the Chinese Communists.

It seems also that the Chinese Muslims will continue to consider themselves as racial minorities and, at the same time, they will struggle to preserve their Islamic faith. In principle, as Communism will not co-exist with religion in the long run, there will remain always a danger to Islam that sooner or later it will be persecuted in China. The danger lies, probably, more in the hands of the Chinese Muslims themselves because unless they voluntarily convert to communism and apostatize Islam, it is not likely that the Chinese Communists will use force to uproot this religion in the near future. In the end, we may conclude that

1. Islam will remain strong and sound enough to survive the difficulties and hardships that the Communists have imposed upon religions in China.

2. The Chinese Muslims, who are mutually related in blood and religion not only form an ethnic minority but also a religious group ; therefore they are different from the Han Chinese. It also appears that continued recognition of the Muslims by the Communists as ethnic minority will aid in maintaining their racial

solidarity which will, in turn, result in strengthening their belief in religion.

3. The Chinese Muslims in Communist China may be members of the Communist Party, but they most likely would not give up Islam for Marxism as their spiritual faith.

4. The difference between the policies of Communist China toward the Muslim communities in leading cities and those in rural areas, will, in course of time, possibly create dissatisfaction in the minds of the Chinese Muslims and is likely to bring forth criticism and bad feeling from the Muslim world.

5. The size of the Chinese Muslim population is neither 48 million nor 10 million, but it should be no less than 20 million on a conservative estimate. As far as their political rights are concerned, they are far from being proportionately represented in the National Assembly in Nationalist China or in the National Peoples' Congress Communist China.

NOTE: Most of the material for this article has been taken from a well documented article contributed by Professor Haji Yusuf Chang of the Department of Oriental Languages and Civilization, University of Chicago. This paper was delivered at the panel on 'Islam in Contemporary Asia' at the 18th Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian Studies in New York on April 4, 1966. It was published in the Voice of Islam in its issue of September 1966.

So far as the relations of the Muslims of Eastern Turkistan with China are concerned, I have taken the material from a pamphlet entitled "Muslims under Russian and Chinese Domination" by Muhammad Emin Bugra, who has played a personal part in the emancipation of Muslims in Eastern Turkistan and was a member of a coalition Government formed in 1946.

Muslims in Russia

Muslims of the free world and other free nations know very little about the large mass of Turk Muslim people under Russian and Chinese subjugation. This mass consists of the peoples of Eastern Turkistan, Western Turkistan, Idil-Ural, Trans-Caucasia, Azerbai jan and Crimea. These countries adjoin one another and have a total area of 7, 058, 840 sq. kms. Total population is 54, 815,000. Besides, there are half a million Muslims in Siberia, annexed to the Russian Empire early in 1850. In other words, there are more than 60 million Muslims under Russian and Chinese dominion. We have already dealt with relations of the Muslims of Eastern Turkistan with different types of Chinese Governments. In this chapter we shall be dealing with the relations of those Muslims who inhabit the above mentioned principalities but through their own mutual rivalries came under Russian domination.

Western Pakistan

Let us begin with Western Turkistan. This country is situated between 42 and 86 degrees longitude and 36 and 55 latitude. Its area is 4, 102,00 sq. kms. This southern region fed by Amu Darya, Sir Darya and other rivers, is extremely fertile and the density of population is high.

It was in mid 7th century, A. C., during Hazrat Usman's Caliphate, that the Arab army began the conquest of Western Turkistan. The other parts of Khowarezm were conquered during the Umayyid Caliph, Abdul Malik's reign, and Transoxiana during that of Sulaiman Ibn Abdul Malik. The northern part continued to be ruled by local kings. Islamic histories mention that Arab soldiers described Western Turkistan as a veritable "Paradise on Earth."

Khowarezm and Transoxiana constituted important parts of the Muslim World. Western Turkistan was administered directly by the Umayyid Caliphs as a province. In the Abbasid period, it became an autonomous region entrusted to the Samanid dynasty. On embracing Islam the Turks of this region served it as a first-rate force in political, military and scientific fields. Political leaders and army commanders of various dynasties like the Tulunies, Khakanis, Ghaznavids, Seljuqs, Khowarezmshahis and others were brought up here. The celebrated book on Hadith known as Sahi-i-el-Bukhari was written by Muhammad Ibn Ismail of Bukhara. Scholars of Hadith like Tirmizi and Sijistani, Fiqah scholars like Shashi, Sarakhsi, Abu-Muti, Marginani and thousands others, philosophers and men of science like Farabi, Ibni Sina, Fargani, Hakeem, Tirmizi, Samarkandi, Abu Ma'ashar, and men of letters like Zemakhsheri, Jamah Kashgari, Sakkaki, Jamal-ud-Din Qarshi and Yusuf Hajib Mahmud belong to this region. When fratricidal wars rent the land, Haroon Bughra Khan conquered Western Turkistan and unified both countries into a single State. Kara Khitay and Mongol invasions wrought havoc upon Western Turkistan, but, miraculously enough, Chaghtai Mongols soon embraced Islam so that Western Turkistan once again became happy and prosperous. It was still so during the times of Amir Timur and his descendants. The Uzbek dynasty which succeeded the Timurids in 1505 also countributed to its progress but due to friction among Uzbek princes and tribal leaders early in the 17th century, it was split into four independent states, namely Khanates of Khive, Bukhara, Fargana and Kazak. This led to distintegration and decadence. Unending squabbles and conflicts based on the greed and rivalry of factions sapped national unity which resulted in political instability and paralysed the social and economic life of the nation. Thus national emasculation led to incapacity for defence against the Russian onslaught, which started early in 1750 but did not gain momentum in the beginning due to strong resistance.

Idil-Ural

Idil-Ural, as big as Turkey, is largely pastoral and arable. The inhabitants are Turk Muslims numbering 800,000. in pre-

Communium days. The largest quantity of oil in the Soviet Union is produced in this land. Its people began to embrace Islam soon after its entry into western Turkistan Cuacssia. In 921 A. C. the ruler of Bulgar, Elmas Selji Khan, sent has envoy to the Abbasid Caliph, El-Muktedir Billah, to foster friendly relations. The Caliph reciprocated by sending a group of scholars, including the celebrated geographer, Ibni Fadlan, to Bulgar. Ever since Islamic culture has been flourishing here. Many eminent scholars of science and culture sprang from it.

The Bulgar kingdom declined on the Mongol invasion under the command of Chengez Khan's son Juji, who founded Altin Orda (Golden Horde) Khanate which later expanded the empire by annexing Russia, Latvania and Ukrainia, all in a very primitive condition at the time compared to Bulgar. In 1254 A. C. its ruler embraced Islam so that the formidable force of Altin Orda and Idil-Ural stood as the bulwark of Islam. Uzbek Khan, who succeeded in 1254 A. C., launched a vigorous compaign to convert all non-Muslim Turks and Mongols of his realm to the Muslim faith. The Altin Orda dynasty adopted the name of Uzbek dynasty at this very time.

In 1490 A. C. the western wing of Altin Orda broke into the kingdoms of Kazan, Hajitarahan, Astarakhan and Crimea. In the East the independent Kazak Kingdom was founded. The territory now called Idil-Ural partly lay in Kazak and partly in Haji Tarhan kingdoms.

The following results came in the wake of this break-up :—

(i) Weakening of national resistance,

(ii) Russian penetration,

(iii) Providing opportunity to Russians, formerly within the Altin Orda kingdom, to organize and consolidate.

This dis-integration was followed by the Russian invasion against the Kazan Khanate. Eleven battles took place during 76 years (1473-1549 A. C.) between the Russians and the Kazan Khanate. Each time the Russians lost, which compelled them to utilise the services of European strategists. They resumed their attacks with the help of German and Swedish engineers, Russia, which was formerly a subject of the Orda Khanate, became a separate entity on its decline and gradually emerged as a new State. Kazan constituted a formidable obstacle for its expansion. Russia failed to remove this barrier in spite of many attacks. At last Ivon IV attacked Kazan with all his might, once in 1550 and again in 1552 with the help of Governor and Swedish technicians. The fortifications of Kazan forces were blown up by explosions controlled by the technicians. This entirely new weapon caused confusion in the lines of Kazan defenders. Russian troops killed every Turk Muslim whom they came across. Thus in a few months nothing was left of the beautiful town and villages of Kazan except eloquent testimonies of Russian barbarism. It was because of this that the nickname of "terrible" was given to Ivan. Soon after this, the Russians invaded Astrakhan (Haji Tarhan) in 1557.

Not content with massacring the brave people of Idil-Ural and occupying the country, Czarist Russia also did its best to absorb this nation. Mosques were converted into churches, the people's national pride was trampled under foot and they were sent to battle-fields to die for the Russian Empire. However the Czarist oppression failed to crush the national spirit and faith in Islam. Young Turks organised guerilla warfare again and again and avenged themselves. Kara Sakat battles, Batrishah uprising and the Salavat Batir action are a few among the national resistance movements that continued for a long time. To the great credit of the people of Idil-Ural, they remained vigilant against assimilation and succeeded in sustaining their national entity in the presence of unparalleled oppression by the Colonialist power. Not only this, but they proved themselves superior to the Russians in wisdom and character throughout.

Trans-Caucasia

This country has a population of 7 million composed of Dagistanis, Cherkes and other tribes, all unified as Muslims. It is a very fertile land. It has oil resources and is the most advanced in industry of all Turk Muslim lands.

Caucasia joined the community of Muslim countries, and during Abdul Malik's reign Islam spread throughout the country. From

100 A. H. Later on the Shambal kingdom was founded. Islamic culture progressed greatly and many eminent scholars and poets appeared. Caucasia was never indifferent to developments in the near and Middle East throughout the history of Islam.

The conquest of Oguz, Mongol, and Ottoman Empires did shake the country, but the Turk Muslim people of Caucasia always stood up on their feet. The event which affected Caucasia most was Russian aggression from the North.

The first aggression in 1594. was resisted successfully by total destruction of the Russian Army 20,000 strong. Subsequent Russian invasions in 1604 and later under the command of Peter the Great were also repelled, with heavy Russian casualties. During Catherine's reign Russian attacks gained momentum, pushing the boundaries of Caucasia to the south bank of river Don. There was confusion and disorder which caused the division of Caucasia into several small Khanates. Russia did not miss the opportunity and intensified her attacks. The Kazak and Fargana Kingdoms were made a province of the Russian Empire while Bukhara and Khive became two Russian protectorates. Thereby traditional, cultural and scientific progress of Western Turkistan suffered a severe set-back. After Russian occupation people experienced horrible tragedies and terrible atrocities, but this brave nation did not submit to alien rule. During 42 years of Czarist Russian domination, fifteen large-scale rebellions took place, which were suppressed by Russian's superior military might. The younger generation of Western Turkistan realised that the best way to meet the Russian challenge was to organize their cultural, economic and social life on modern lines. Hence it diverted its effort in this direction. Czarist Russia did its best, in collaboration with local conservative elements, to undermine the new movement. At this juncture the Communist Revolution followed World War I. Foreseeing the fall of the Russian Empire, the intelligentsia and rest of the population had organized themselves and declared independence in various localities. Lenin recognised the independence of Bukhara, but later, when Bolshevism had established itself, went back upon it.

Under the prophet of Islam, North Caucasian rulers fought a defensive war against Russia under Iran's protection. After Nadir Shah's assasination there remained no strong government in Iran for long. During this period Russia intensified her attacks. Shamhal; the ruler of Trans-Caucasia, and a few of the Beys submitted to her. However, the freedom-loving people of Caucasia countinued the holy struggle under the command of their grea scholar, Sheykh Mansur. After eighteen years of unceasing warfare, which caused heavy losses to the Russians, Sheykh Mansur was captured in Anaba. Even this did not end the popular resistance. Caucasia successfully countered Russian aggression from 1604 to 1801. In the meantime Russian forces advanced towards Gurgistan and Azarbaijan via Caspain Sea, surrounding the Dagistan and Chechen provinces of Caucasia. Their ruling communities surrendered without much resistance, while the people, under the leadership of Ghazi Mohammad waged a holy Jehad for another ten years. His successor, Hamza, knocked out the Russians several times and destroyed Khanates and Beydoms.

In 1834 Shamil, with the title of Imam, succeeded Hamza as the leader of the Mujahideen. He scattered the formidable Russian army. The Czar was determined to conquer Caucasia at any cost. Therefore he sent army after army under the command of his ablest Russian and German generals. The aggressors built forts in every city they captured by surprise attacks on Shamil's men. Shamil had. cannons made that destroyed Russian fortifications. His victories over the Russian army of 200,000 strong made him a world—famous hero. He did not confine his actions to the defence of his territory, but also succeeded in liberatingcertain other territories already captured by the enemy. The victory of the Ottoman Empire and allied forces over Russia in the Crimean War (1852) inspired great hopes in Caucasia and allied assistance was expected. But Britain and France refrained from supporting the Mujahideen. After the conclusion of "Crimean War Peace Treaty", Russia diverted her full attention towards Trans-Caucasia. Though Shamil realised the inevitability of defeat in absence of any assistance, he resigned himself to God and decided to fight to the end. He and his Mujahideen defended to the last town, and last village. Ultimately the last mosque where he his family and a few of his surviving followers were present was captured. Because of the stout resistance of the Turks of Crimea, Czarist Russia had to conclude a non-aggression treaty with the Khanate of Crimea. But Catherina violated the treaty in 1788 and invaded Crimea with an army. In order to terrorise people the immense Russian army behaved with extreme brutality. The town or village which resisted was destroyed and its inhabitants were ruthlessly massacred. In a single battle at Karasu Bazar 30,000 Muslims were killed. The Russians aimed at total annihilation of the people by massacre and forced emigration. They resorted to all sorts of inhuman and barbauic means. In a very short time 300,000 Crimeans were compelled to leave their homes to take asylum in foreign countries. Russia's policy aimed at making the beautiful land a permanent part of Russia but Turk Muslims of Crimea who held their country dearer than their lives, rendered absorption by Russia difficult. The Russians subjected them to the most savage oppression, an account of which has been given by impartial scholars like Professor Clark, DeBua and others. This aggression against life, religion and property of the Crimeans continued for 150 years. The mosques and Madrassas were demolished without exception.

Like other sister nations within the Russian Empire, Crimea was also represented in the Russian National Assembly in 1905 and had the opportunity of defending her legal rights. The publication of the periodical "Tarjuman" of Ismail Gasparili which spread the idea of nationalism, pertains to this period.

Azarbaijan

After the death of Nadirshah, Azarbaijan was divided into small Khanates. The Iranian Governor of Tabriz, Riza Khan proposed the formation of an independent State of Azarbijan to restore order and counter Russian menace. Russia promoted discord and mistrust among the Khanates, so that each was by turn compelled to accept Russian domination. Genje fell in 1805, Kuba and Caku in 1806, Seki in 1815, Sirva in 1820 and Karabagh in 1822. However the brave Turkish tribes refused to submit. The story of their leader, Javad Khan, peraism has become a national legend. The Iranian prince, Abbas

Mirza, attacked the Russians in 1824 in collaboration with the Turks of Azarbaijan. The Russians defeated Abbas Mirza and entered Iranian Azarbaijan in 1827. Consequently the famous Treaty of Turkmen Chayi was concluded 1828, according to which Azarbaijan was finally divided into Russian and Iranian territories. The people of Russian Azarbaijan, helpless as they were, realised that the only way to preserve their national existence was to adjust their life and keep pace with the times. The people of Azarbaijan have since progressed remarkably.

Siberia

Siberia is situated in the East of Idil-Ural and North of Turkistan. It was originally inhabited by the tribes of Turkish stock called Sunar or Sabir or Savir, which probably gave the country its name—Siberia. The Russian invasion of Siberia commenced after the conquest of Idil-Ural. Siberia was defended by the Muslim Turk rulers, Guchen Khan and his sons, Ali Khan and Ishim Khan, for full forty years. Its Southern, western, eastern regions were inhabited throughout by tribes of Turkish stock, while the Northern region was inhabited by Fin tribes and Eskimos. During both Czarist and Communist regimes, Siberia was a place of exile. Its population at present is estimated at 19,500,000, five million being Turkish tribes and the rest exiles.

Under subjugation of Czarist Russia, the Turk Muslims expected the fall of the ruthless Empire and their eventual liberation. Towards the end of World War I, the long expected moment arrived. The Bolshevik revolution broke out and Czardom became a matter of history. The Turk Muslims availed themselves of the opportunity to get rid of foreign domination. Idil-Ural and Crimea declared independence at the end of 1917, with Western Turkistan, North Caucasia and Azarbaijain following suit in May, 1918. Some governments, including that of Soviet Russia, formally recognised their independence.

Communist Occupation and Oppression

The treacherous attitude adopted by Lenin and his colleagues towards the freedom-loving people during the early years of the Bolshevik revolution is evident from the historic "Declaration of Russian Revolution" of 15th November 1917 signed by Lenin and Stalin. It reads: "Mohammandans of Russia, Tartars of Volga, and Crimea, Kirghiz and Sarts of Turkistan, Turks and Tartars of Trans-Caucasia and all those whose mosques and prayer houses were destroyed and whose religion and customs were trampled upon by the Russian Czars and tryants! henceforth your faith and customs, your national and cultural institutions, are proclaimed free and inviolable. Build up your national life freely and unhindered. This is your right. Soviet Revolution shall protect and honour you and that of all nationals of Soviet Union. What Soviet Government demands from you is your co-operation."

The Council of People's Commissars decided to base its works in relation to nationalities on the following principles:

(1) Equality and sovereignty of Russia.

(2) The right of the nations of Russia to free self—determination including the right to secede and form independent states.

But as soon as they established their regime and formed the Red Army the communists trampled the independence of these nations.

The people who believed that the golden age for them had dawned, soon realised that the purpose behind the declaration was to lure and deceive them in order to prevent their consolidation and possible procurement of arms from outside.

Despite this the Bolsheviks met with very stiff resistance. Even those who were taken by surprise and fought under most adverse conditions, resisted for at least two years. Those relatively better off fought against the Communists until 1925.

Thus Lenin became the founder of the Second Russian Imperialism. If there is any difference in terms of atrocity between him and Ivan the terrible, the founder of Czarist Rusian Imperialism, it lies in the fact that Ivan perpetrated his brutality under "Cress" while Lenin did it under "Hammer and Sickle."

Having completed the Communist conquest, steps were taken to eliminate elements of resistance—religcus persons, intelligentsia, army officers, the rich and all those who had taken part in national movements. They were imprisond and rendered "harmless", i. e. killed. Their families were deported to distant Siberia. The Bolsheviks believed this would put an end to the struggle for freedom of the Turk Muslim people. But their expecations were belied as under-ground resistance continued. Secret political committees kept active in assassinating Communist agents and and sabotaging the drive for centralization of economic resources.

This convinced Lenin of Stalin's theory that unless the non-Russian subjects of Soviet Russia were subjected to terror and annihilation in a more ruthless manner than in the time of Czarist Russia, it would not be possible to impose Communism upon them. Therefore the Bolshevik regime determined to annihilate the Turkish Muslim people.

The "achievements" of the Communist regime may be described as follows according to a Turkish Muslim who has made a thorough study of the subject.

Political Pressure:

When these countries were brought under military control, the Communist regime

(i) Divided a single nation composed of peoples tied together with common language, race, religion, culture and other characteristics, into several small unities; made each unit a separate nation, i. e. Western Turkistan was divided into six nations, viz., Republics of Uzbekistan, Kazakistan, Kirghizistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and autonomous province of Karakalpak. Idil-Ural was also divided into six, namely Republics of Tatar, bashkird and autonomous province of Murdar and other two provinces. Similarly Azarbaijan was split into four, Republic of Azarbaijan and autonomous provinces of Nakhcivan, Abkhazya, and Southern Osetin. Trans Caucasia was divided into ten: Daglstan, Chichen, Engush, Osetiya, Kabartay, Bolkar, Karachay, Cherkes Edge and Kalmuk and autonomous provinces of Grezni, Maykeb and Karadeniz.

Actual authority rested with Moscow-appointed Russian Officials called "advisors" in the so-called republics or autonomous provinces of the artificial nations. Only in Uzbekistan Rebublic 7% of Government employees are Russian. In other republics the percentage varies from 72% to 80%.

This indicates what Russian Imperialism meant by the "Solution of the problem of nationalities." It meant the destruction of the national entity of the peoples and dividing them into smallar bits which were relatively easier to swallow. Some of the autonomous provinces set up in Idil-Ural were annexed to RSFSR (Russia proper) later on apparently because the indigenous population had become a minority. Similarly the provinces in Trans Caucasia, the Checen, Engush, Balkar-Karachay and Kalmuk Republics were annexed to Russia proper because the entire indigenous population was deported to other places and so no question of nationality existed there. As the entire Turk Muslim population of Crimea was deported from the country, it was annexed to Ukrainia. The percentage of population in Kazak and Uzbek Republics is quickly running in favour of Russian Colonialists in conformity with the principles of forced disintegration and final assimilation. We have never heard of any "nation" demanding secession from the Soviet Union, whereas the high sounding "Declaration of Rights" allows this. What is the reason? The communists say because people themselves want to remain in the "paradise of Communism." Leave aside demanding seccession from the Soviet Union, thousands of indigenous loyal Communists have lost their lives simply for attempting to protect certain extremely unimportant rights of their respective communities. Faiyzullah Khawaja, Ekmel Ikram in Turkistan and Bagiref in Azarbajan are only a few of them who were executed.

Anti-religious Measures

It is well known that Communism does not see eye to eye with religions, being particularly hostile to Islam, which aims at improving the social life of humanity. Hence this is the first religion which Communism aims at destroying. Lenin said, "Religion is opium which intoxicates nations," and "Marxism believes that places of Worship and all other institutions of religion are tools in the hands of Clergymen to exploit the toilers." The Soviet Constitution provides freedom of faith and worship to all citizens of the "Union". But another article forbids any faith and ideology contrary to the principles of Communism.

The Bolsheviks have not only forbidden teaching of Islam in schools but also instruction on religious subjects in private which is declared to be a crime.

The Bolsheviks confiscated all the mosques, madrassas and private shools throughout Turkistan, which were once the centers of Islamic education. Only a few out of countless religious institutions have been left open for public. These are: Masjid Kalan in Bukhara, Masjide Tillakari in Samarkand, the Sheykh Antahur and the Khan mosque in Fargana. According to reliable statistics, there were eight thousand mosques all over the Turk Muslim Countries before the Communist reign while today only 500 exist. They have been spared not as a favour to the public, but for use as an instrument of deceiving Muslim visitors from the free world. The confiscated religious public properties have been either demolished or converted into cinemas, theatres and stores. Though there is no legislation forbidding worship, yet worship is hindered and discouraged in the following way :—

(i) "Societies of the Godless" are at work to destroy religion in all Turk Muslim lands in Soviet Russia. Among other things these societies are engaged in intimidation, insult and discouragement of those who practise religion.

(ii) Every individual is compelled to work. Rules are so rigid that one cannot leave one's job even for short intervals needed for prayer. The defaulter is dismissed to starve with his family.

All religious leaders with the exception of a few agents in disguise have been executed or deported to Siberia.

In fact, Stalin had accorded freedom of religion during the dark days of World War II. Some of the previously closed mosques were reopened in Western Turkistan and other places. But the taxes levied upon mosques in post-war days were so exorbitant that they had to be closed again.

(iii) Again during the war Stalin permitted reopening of the historical Mir Arab Madrasa of Bukhara. It is open even now, but at present its function is to train Communist agents in disguise of men of religion. It is controlled by the Communist party's central committee.

I. *Pressure against national existence:*

1. All Muslims under Russian and Chinese domination are racially Turks, as 5/6th part of their land is called Turkestan since very old times. The Communist regime, as discussed above, divided these countries into small fragments and gave a fabricated name to each. They are forbidden to call themselves Turks—the factor which unites them as a nation. One who calls himself a Turk or says he belongs to Turkestan is labelled as a traitor and punished with execution or exile.

2. From the very beginning of the Islamic era the Muslim Turks had adopted the Arabic script, in which all their literature had been written. In 1928 the Latin script and later the Cyrillic (Russian) was introduced by force, the purpose being to isolate the younger generation from its national history and literature, thereby killing the national ideology inspired by these sources. Thus the Communists have not only divided and disintegrated them but have also attempted to deMuslimise, denationalize and Russify the nation completely and create a barrier between the enslaved Muslims on the one side and free Muslims on the other.

3. Muslims are expropriated and deported en-masse from land inherited from ancestors, under bayonets of savage Russian soldiers and are taken to the Tundra regions to work in mines till they perish from starvation and cold. Russian settlers take their places in their beautiful home. Mass deportation is the greatest threat to the national existence of these people.

4. One day in the year 1994, with 24 hours notice, the entire Turk Muslim population of Crimea was gathered in squares,

loaded in goods trains and deported to Siberia and North Russia under the bayonets of the Red Army. Similarly the Ingush, Karachay, Balkar and Kalmuk tribes of Trans-caucasia were deported with 24 hours notice to the same destinations. The number of Muslims thus deported is over two millions.

The aim of Communist Russia in doing so is nothing but total annihilation of Muslim Turks. The communist regime did not miss any opportunity, however insignificant it might be, to commit genocide, and to follow a deliberate policy of causing famine. Approximately five million men, women and children have been thus victimised. This fact can be verified by studying soviet official Census Statistics. The following figures based on Soviet Official Statistics on population of Kazakistan alone speak for themselves:

1926	1939	1969	
4,534,000	3,500,000	3,264,000	Non-Russian.

Here is a vivid manifestation of Communist genocide drop of population by 1,300,000 in 24 years period in Kazakistan only. Kazakistan is not an exception among Turk Muslim territories under Russian domination.

II. *Economic Pressure*:—It is beyond the scope of this chapter to analyse Soviet Economic Policy in detail. However our object is to reveal how Russian and Chinese colonialists have exploited the economy of subject countries in the name of "Communist Economic Policy."

The Muslim countries provide agricultural products and minerals which Russian provinces cannot produce. The economic resources of these countries are not utilised for the benefit of the Soviet people at large, as the Russians claim, but in fact, they are used in the interest of the Russians, that is to say, for the furtherance of Communist Imperialism, espionage and propaganda.

Lands centralised as Kolkhoz and Sovkhoz (people's Farms and State Farms respectively) are the property of the Kremlin. The tiller who labours on them gets a stomach-ful only as wages. The southern part of Western Turkistan is compelled to produce only cotton to be fed to textile mills in Russia. Cultivation for local use of any other kind of commodity, even food grains, is an offence. Those who produce cotton, in return get the wage of an ordinary labourer only. Petroleum from Western Turkestan, Caucasia and Idil-Ural is taken to Russia without any compensation. The people from whose land petrol is produced have no share.

Similarly all mineral and agricultural products and all live-stock belong to the State. To maintain the prosperity of the Russians, whose lands produce nothing but cabbages and potatoes, rich products of Turkish lands are being usurped. Imagine the plight of an indigenous person, who cannot eat grape produced at home and sees that it is sold in the markets of Moscow as cheap as water

Even if we admit that certain agricultural and industrial developments have brought a certain degree of prosperity to these lands, it must not be forgotten that it cost religion, culture and politics. Nobody denies that liberty is the most sacred right of every human being. One should be an animal; devoid of all human values and qualities, to be content with that much material advantage against physical, spiritual and mental slavery.

III. *Pressure on social life*

In the said Turk Muslim countries there existed originally a social order based on Islamic teaching and national characteristics. It is no secret that duplicity, deceitfulness and dishonesty are qualities regarded as skill and proficency in the Communist—applied political science. We only try to elucidate the fact how the people whose national principle of life is to keep up human dignity and moral values, are being dragged away from this sacred conception.

So long as the Muslim Turk is under Communist bondage he finds himself in danger, if and when he acts in accordanee with his belief and conscience. He hates to be ruled by Red Russian and Red Chinese; but to express this hatred means DEATH. He is not happy to live a slave's life, but to express his feelings means annihilation. To him the best course of action, certainly, is to act in the interest of his faith and nation, but for him it is an impossibility. Therefore so long as he desires to live, he has to remain a hypocrite and liar. Even the religious personalities who survive are those who have preferred to live and act according to the directives of the Communist party, working as secret Red agents, rather than remaining true to the commandments of God Almighty.

Family life has been shattered completely. Every member of a family is obliged to watch closely the movements of the other members of his family and submit periodical reports to party-intelligence or local police. Those who fail to comply with the directives of party-intelligence are labelled as "enemy of the people" and get punished accordingly. Millions of innocent persons have lost their lives or been banished on the intelligence reports of their wives and children.

IV. *Pressure against national culture*: Education has been completely Russified. As pointed out earlier, religious education has been legally banned. The new system of education is so arranged that it detaches the young from their national environment ; they memorise principles of Communism and are steadily dragged towards Russification.

Communist administration has denied to the people freedom of speech, freedom of press, gathering and travel.

In the end, it may be concluded that it seems impossible to save the culture and religion of Muslims who live under the communist regime which is deadly against religion, particularly Islam. In such circumstances it is imperative on all Muslims to close their ranks and unite themselves in a third block which may be in a position to act as a deterrent to the aggression of the two antagonstic blocks viz. Capitalism on the one hand and Communism on the other.

Muslims in Ethiopia

From the Communist countries in Asia, now let us turn our attention to the condition of Muslims in a Christian country, namely Ethiopia in Africa. In order to fully appreciate the condition of Muslims in this part of the Continent, we need a brief historical account of the subject. Contacts between the ancient Abyssinian Kingdom and Islam go back to the period of the Holy Prophet, Muhammad. Persecuted Muslims from Mecca took refuge twice in the kingdom of Abyssinia, whose king, Negus, gave willing shelter to them in spite of the remonstrances of important leaders of the Quraiysh tribe. Amicable correspondence between the Prophet of Islam and the Abyssinian king was also exchanged.

In the first century of the Hijra (7th century A.C.) Arab traders and immigrants carried Islam forward to the African parts of present Eritaria and Somalia. Slowly but steadily Islam penetrated deep into the heart of Abyssinia. By the end of the eleventh century, seven Islamic kingdoms had flourished in the north-east, east and south-east of the country. These were Ifat, Hadia, Arbabini, Sherkha, Duwaro, Dara and Bali. Either Negus, king of Abyssinia, was inwardly converted to Islam or possessed humane qualities. Hence during the time of the Holy Prophet, he showed enough tolerance to the early migrants to his country. This, no doubt, encouraged the early Muslims to spread their faith into the heart of Abyssinia. This state of affairs could not be tolerated any longer by those Christian Abyssinian monarchs who were deeply interested in their own faith, or rather were desirous of promoting Christianity. However, there was no justification for any persecution on the part of these Christian monarchs. By fair means they could also convert the pagans to their side. But as Christianity had no charm against Islam which not only advocates equality but its followers also practised it in all respects, these Christian monarchs adopted a policy of ruthless persecution towards Islam so that it might be altogether eliminated from Africa and leave a fruitful place for conversion to Christianity. Consequently some of them showed extreme intolerance towards Muslims. They waged sanguinary wars against them which lasted for over five centuries. Both sides suffered formidable losses, but neither could subdue the other.

With the lapse of time, Islam made peaceful penetration into the interior of the country. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries most of the pagan Galla tribes of the south and south-west were converted to Islam. The rapid spread of Islam aroused the indignation of th eChristian rulers who were afraid lest the Church should succumb to the teachings of the new religion. Consequently they launched apolicy of unrelenting persecution against the Muslims. King Taidiose (Theodore) being an enemy of Islam, persecuted Muslims dring his regime. His successor, King Yohannes (Jhon), was still worse. In 1878 he declared his famous ordinance of compulsory baptism. Thomas Arnold, in his book "The Preaching of Islām", estimated that over 55,000 Muslims were forcibly baptised, and others were either turned out of their homes or cruelly annihilated.

King Menelik II succeeded at a time when with the opening of the Suez Canal in 1869 the whole east coast of Africa was open to the foreigners for holding their political supremacy in this part of the dark continent. Britain, France, Italy and Portugal all entered the contest. The four powers appeased the Abyssinian king by presenting him with large quantities of arms and ammunitions in return for his recognition of their special spheres of influence. Thus he was put in a position of supremacy. He, in his turn, started to swallow up the fully independent Muslim Sultanates around his kingdom. The Sultanates of Harar, Ausa, Wallow, Jimma, Arusi, Ogaden and others resisted bravely the aggressor but their old traditional weapons of swords and spears were no match for the modern weapons supplied by the above-mentioned European powers, and their complete annihilation was inevitable. The conquests were followed by ruthless mass killings and devastation. A contemporary Norwegian author, John Bhccholzer, has given a vivid description of these invasions in his book "The Land of the Burnt Races."

This is how the present Ethiopian empire was set up. Menelik's policy was full of hate, prejudice and excessive partiality against the newly colonized Muslims. Armed bands roamed about and looted the country in the ancient ethiopian tradition capturing the people and confiscating their lands. Mr. E. W. Luther describes Menelik's conquests as follows: "Vast areas of land were conquered by the Emperor Menelik II during his far ranging campaigns at the end of the last century. Many of these were added outright to his personal domain, some were granted to his favourites and loyal soldiers, a few were left in the hands of the conquered peoples".

Menelik made open attempt to uproot Islam by closing down the Arabic schools and confiscating their endowed properties. He imprisoned and tortured the Sheikhs and Ulama (religious heads) in order to force them to give up their mission of preaching.

By the tripartite treaty of 1906, Menelik granted the three European powers, viz England, France and Italy, special spheres of influence in the conquered Muslim regions. These were for France the railway to Djibouti in which France had exploited Muslim labourers for over twenty years; for Italy a strip of land across the territory connecting her two colonies of Somaliland and Eritara: and for Britain the rest.

Menelik's death in 1913 put an end to his iniquitous and brutal rule. During the brief rule of his successor the Emperor Lij Eyasu (1913-1916) Muslims were given a breathing space. Unfortunately Eyasus' rule was short-lived. He was ousted in 1916 by the Amhara chiefs and notables.

After ten years' bitter struggle for power, finally Haile Selassie was crowned as Emperor. Being an educated youth, it was expected that the new Emperor would start an era of justice and fairplay. But that hope soon evaporated under the intensive heat of the traditional policy of hatred towards the Muslims and repression which the Emperor adopted. The reason was that the Emperor fell under the influence of the Orthodox Church, which is infamous for its intolerance. Under this influence an evil colonial regime based mainly on religious discrimination was established. The Ambara, the Emperor's ruling tribe. took control of all the affairs of the country. The Galla, Gurage, Danakii, Harari and other tribes who make up about 70 per cent of the total population, and are mainly Muslims, are completely excluded from all responsible government posts and deprived of education and other fundamental human rights.

If there is one element whose pre-eminence in the political structure is beyond dispute, it is Ethiopian Orthodox Church. Although its adherents comprise a minority of the population, out-numbered by the Muslims and the pagan tribes, it is intertwined with the political forces of the country in a way that greatly enhances its intolerance against all faiths.

Christianity has been the official religion of Ethiopia according to the Constitution of 1955, as specifically stated in Article 126. The same article says: "The Emperor shall always profess the Ethiopian Orthodox faith." Thus it rules out the possibility of a Muslim Emperor or of any other faith. The Emperor has always been the secular head of the Ethiopion Church, as well as the head of the State. The same article states that: "The name of the Emperor shall be mentioned in all religious services", thus emphasizing a new the close connection between Church and State that has always existed in Ethiopia.

Article 21 rules the Emperor to say: "We shall profess and shall defend the holy Orthodox faith." In his book, "Inside Africa", John Gunther estimated the number of priests to be one-fifth of the Christian population, and the number of churches and monasteries over 15,000.

So long as the power of the Church is pervasive, there seems to be little hope for a healthy change. Consequently, Muslims have either to resign themselves to the present intolerable oppression, or otherwise fight for their identity.

Speaking about Islam in Ethiopia, Mr. Ernest Luther in his book, "Ethiopia Today", said: "Although Ethiopia's Muslims constitute some one-third (pagans are excluded) of the country's population, their influence on the contemporary Ethiopian scene is completely overshadowed by the dominating political position of Amhara Christianity. Today Islam is not a force politically. It is significant that Amhara are so distrustful of Islam that very few are to be found in positions in the Ethiopian Government."

It is not possible to give an accurate estimate of the present-day population of Ethiopia, because no national census has ever been taken. The Ethiopian Government claimed a total of 20 million in 1960, compared with a British estimate of 10 million just after World War II. In the situation 15 million will be a fair guess. When we consider the distribution of this total among the major religious groups, the result becomes more shadowy. The Government claims a rate as high as 67 per cent of the population for Christianity, but Muslims have challenged this figure and claim to be 67 per cent. Italian estimates equated the adherents of the two religions (pagan tribes who make up about 17 per cent of the population are excluded). A booklet published by the Press and Information Department on the occasion of the Addis Ababa exhibition in 1951 stated: "Although Ethiopia is known as a Christian nation Muslims are here in number almost equal to the Christian......"

From these and other such statements it can safely be concluded that the Muslims are at least equal to, if not more than, the Christians. Despite this fact the Ethiopian Government has persistently ignored the whole matter of Muslims' existence in the country. The Emperor's address to the American Congress during his tour in 1954 reflects light on this fact. Here are his exact words: "The strength of the Christian heritage unites two peoples across the globe in a national history, and as a force for the unification of the Empire of Ethiopia. It is this force which gives us. among the other countries of the Middle East, a profound orientation towards the West. We read the same Bible. We speak a common spiritual language. It is here that our common Christian heritage unites two peoples across the globe in a community of ideals and endeavours."

Thus, as it can obviously be seen from his words, the Emperor very conveniently ignored the whole matter of Islam in Ethiopia. This is a sad consequence of the Emperor's and Church's blind fanaticism. As a result of this evil policy, Muslims are completely eliminated from the Government positions. Be it low or high, there is no post for them. There is not a single Muslim in the Cabinet of 16 ministers. Among lower officials the rate of Muslims is less than 2 per cent. The traditional rule ordains that "the Government organs and all advantages expected therein are the monopolized privileges of the Amhara ruling tribe."

Worst of all, the Ethiopian Constitution, by emphasizing the close connection between Church and State, has legalized a "crusade against Islam". The constitutional phrase describing the Emperor as "Defender of the Holy Cross" has already been converted, in practice, into "Offender against Islam."

So far as Muslims are concerned, Haile Selassie has, unfortunately, resumed the deplorable policy of his ancestors. He put in strenuous efforts to convert Muslims to his Orthodox faith. For this purpose he closed all the centres of Islamic culture in Harar, Jimma, Dawi, Ifat and elsewhere. He prohibited the studies of the Arab language which is the only medium for Islamic education in this country, and erected an iron curtain around Muslim regions with a view to isolating them from Islamic institutions abroad. No Ulama are allowed to penetrate Muslim lands. The Azhar Mission of Egypt in 1951 was forced to leave Addis Ababa within a few hours of their arrival. Muslims are compelled to pay a tribute to the Church termed "moral income."

Worst of all, the Emperor has waged wicked wars against all intellectual pursuits. It was remarked by all explorers of the nineteenth century, who visited the Muslim Sultanates, that numerous literary movements were thriving. Today, however, none of these exist owing to the senseless antagonism of the Ethiopian monarchs. At present educational institutions in

Muslim regions are reduced to extreme rarity. Despite the fact that Muslims are subjected to numerous taxes, including educational tax, no school has ever been opened in a Muslim region unless the Christian children have first been provided for. Estimates of 1959 revealed the meagre figure of 2,000 Muslim children receiving education, as against 140,000 Christian students.

There used to be special courts for Muslims called "Shari'ah Courts" presided over by Kadhis, to deal with Muslim marriages, inheritance and other matters. Today, however, by virtue of the new code entitled "Yefita Ber Hig" (Civil Law), promulgated by the Emperor by Order No. 185 on Miyaziya 27, 1952 (1960), and enacted on 1st Maskaram 1953 (1961) the Shari'ah courts are, in practice, abolished.

The new civil law is largely customary, based on an ancient book of laws called Fatha Neguest. It is a thirteenth century compilation of ecclesiastical laws introduced into Ethiopia by an Egyptian Copt named al-Asad al-Asal. This book is a confusion of Jewish and Biblical codes and a vast amount of customary laws. It has for long served as th ebasic reference for the settlement of disputes among the people of the Copt sect in Ethiopia.

The new civil law book comprises 3,387 articles. It is manifest without any comment that a codification based on Church laws shall irrefutably be an obvious contradiction to the Islamic laws. A glance at the matrimonial and inheritance sections will suffice to turn light on these grave encoachments.

Article 580 legalized illegitimate customary union between man and woman, and that a child born of such unholy union is legally capable to receive inheritance if he is recognized by the father (Article 584).

Articles 626—656 are virtual abrogation of all Islamic inheritance systems. These articles, totaling 30 deal with heritage based on laws, customs and codifications completely alien to Islamic law. Respect for the Islamic inheritance laws is completely denied. Thus the functioning of the Shari'ah courts, which are so far not formally dissolved, is in practice paralysed

Muslims, being panic-stricken and bitterly desperate over the future of their faith, protested strongly to the Emperor. The few Muslim members in Parliament, headed by Abdullah Mome, Deputy of Harar, raised a strong objection to these open infringements and submitted a complaint to the Emperor. But all were to no avail. The Emperor ratified his new civil law, and the puppet parliament rubber stamped it. Muslims rightly consider the new civil law, which has been imposed on them by the Christian ecclesiastical authority, as a gross injustice against Islam.

Provincial administration in Ethiopia is organized along the following divisions: the country is divided into twelve provinces (Awaraja) which are headed by princes and Rases (dukes) responsible to the Emperor. Not a single one of them is a Muslim. The provinces are divided into 74 subprovinces (Warrada) ruled by governors (Agara Gazhi). Also none of them is a Muslim. Finally, the subprovinces are broken into 1,122 districts ruled by district governors (Mislanye). Only about 73 of these are Muslims.

The New York Times of 14th July 1960 alluded to such cruel actions by stating: "Haile Selassie also arranged to keep from the delegates the nasty story of the massacre at the town of Yirga Alem last March, when his police shot down hundreds of peasents who revolted against their feudal landlords."

In 1943, on a moonless night, a company of the Emperor's army launched a violent attack upon the Sultanate of Awsa. The innocent Sultan Muhammad Yayo was taken prisoner to Addis Ababa and put to death in the Alem Bhkagna Prison. Awsa was left in ruin. The reason for that treacherous act is still unknown.

In 1948, for fear of similar danger in their area, the people of Harar appealed to the Emperor for protection. The Emperor responded by terrorism and threats instead of law, justice and security. The familiar military forces were let loose. Over 1,500 people were put in jail. Many prominent men disappeared—just vanished. The traditional policy of arbitrary appropriation resulted in tremendous damage to the economy of Harar.

Muslim farms and plantations have suffered gradual infiltration of Amhara settlers, who are compelled by the Government to migrate with the object of gaining control over the fertile land of Wallo, Harar, Arusi and Jimma. Muslims' legitimate attempts to retain their lands were met with extreme severity. Armed forces were despatched several times to crush peaceful resistance of the farmers. History will one day reveal to the world hidden tragedies of wanton slaughter. The events of Bati, Aarfa and Arguba (Wallo Province) in 1936 were nothing more than savage destruction of helpless unarmed men, women and children. Similar atrocious actions were repeated against the Muslims of Yazo (Wallo), Gersum and Kambulsha (Harar). In 1953 the district of Dawi (Wallo) was put in complete ruin by Colonel Abebe Gemmade, whom the Emperor met and authorized at Debre Berhan (Shoa Province). Fifty-five men were publicly hanged by the army in twelve villages of the district in the presence of their women folk and relatives without fair trial.

The Emperor's policy towards his Eastern neighbours (i. e. Eriteria and Somalia) has always been based on groundless suspicion. He opposed the liberation of these countries. In 1950 he plotted with certain imperialist powers to incorporate them into his empire. His plot against Eriteria was successful. Through the help of Western imperialists, the General Assembly of the United Nations issued Resolution No. 390A (V) on 2 December 1950 to the effect of federation with Ethiopia on the basis of the "full autonomy for the Eriterian Government in all domestic affairs and a democratic regime in Eriteria with all its requisites and safeguards".

On 11 September 1952 the Emperor ratified the United Nations Resolution. After 19 September 1952 the British administration handed powers over to the head of the Eriterian Government and to the representative of the Emperor in Eriteria. Since that day Eriteria entered into the noose of colonialism and was entangled in endless and inextricable problems arising from the absence of the Federal Government which was supposed to be in charge of Federal affairs and to settle disputes between the Governments of Eriteria and Ethiopia as mentioned in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the U. N. Resolution. The Ethiopian Government imposed itself in place of the federal government, disregarding the U. N. Resolution and heedless of all pledges and undertakings given by the Emperor. Here is an extract from the detailed memorandum submitted by the Eriterian Leaders to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1957:

"During the last five years the Eriterians have suffered at the hands of the Ethiopian Government more than they have endured during 70 years of colonial oppression. The frustration of the Eriterian people is pushing them to the verge of a desperate revolution. Their patience has reached its breaking-point. Mindful of the fact that the prolongation of the present state of affairs between the Eriterian people and Ethiopian Government may jeopardise world peace, they decided to appeal to the United Nations."

Unfortunately, the Secretary-General of the U. N. lent a deaf ear to this legal complaint, a thing which shook the trust of the Eriterian people in the U. N. humanitarian role.

As to Somalia, despite the Emperor's plots and strong opposition. the resolute independent-minded Somali people managed to save their country from Ethiopian imperialism. At the end of the ten-years period of U. N. trusteeship, Somalia declared her independence on 1 July 1960. Nevertheless, the problem of the Ethio-Somalia frontier is still unsettled. The Emperor is colonizing a large area of Somaliland named Ogaden. The existing boundary of Ethio-Somalia was the result of colonialist conspiracies which carved Somalia into five parts—British, French, Italian, Ethiopian and Kenyan (N. D. D.). The boundaries among these political divisions were not drawn on any ethnic, tribal or economic considerations.

The Emperor's insistence to colonize the Somali regions of Ogaden. will abstruct the solution of the frontier with peaceful system,

Muslims in Philippines

In this chapter I would like to revert once again to the Asian Continent in order to describe the condition of Muslims in a democratically governed Christian country i.e. the Philippines. The reason which has prompted me to deal with this insignificant minority is my personal knowledge about them. It was in 1963 that I was granted a **Seato** scholarship in order to deliver a series of lectures at the newly established Mindanao State University situated in Marawi city which has got preponderating majority of the Muslims, for a period of three months. As a guest of the Vice-Chancellor who was a Christian, I had close contacts with the Christian Staff and students who formed the majority and as a Muslim I was invited by Mr. Madki Alanto, the Muslim Governor of the Province of Lanao-Dil-Sour, to address my Muslim brethren every Friday in some mosque, and as such came into close touch with them.

Advent of Islam in the Philippines.

According to reliable historical records, Islam was introduced into the Philippines in the latter part of the 14th century or nearly two hundred years before the introduction of Christianity by the Spanish seafarers. Arab, Iranian. Indian, and Malaysian religious missionary traders and plain adventurers in several waves were the main carriers of Islam here.

When Spaniards conquered the Philippines in the 16th century, Islam had spread in the islands to such an extent that most of the Sultanates and principalities in the country were held by the Muslims.

Spaniards came in 1521 and started conquering the area and imposing Christianity. Where Islam was not rooted well, it fell an easy pray to Spain's more advanced and stronger armed force. But where it was firmly rooted, its believers continued resisting until the close of the 19th century when Spaniards were expelled from the Island by the United States of America.

The Spanish-given name "Moros" refers to over 2,000,000 Muslims predominantly inhabiting south and western Mindanao and Sulu and many other islands. The Moros, according to Dean C. Worcester, exemplify what may be considered the highest state of civilization to which the Malays have ever attained unaided. They are the descendents of the latest Malay invaders and were at the time of the discovery of the islands rapidly prosecuting an effective campaign for their "Muhammedanization."

Historians further assert that the Moros were the first to introduce into the Philippines an advanced method of warfare with the use of gunpowder and fire arms. Posession of such a virile civilization prompted them to resist any foreign invasion. According to General John J. Pershing, they were among the bravest and fiercest fighters in the world. They defied the Spanish conquest to preserve their freedom and ways of life.

The term Manaraw, which means people of the Lake, refers to about 300,000 natives of Lanao Province and the cities of Banslan and Illigan in north-western Mindanao. The Province has recently been split into two provinces, Lanao del Norte and Lanao del Sur. In the latter the Muslims constituted a majority of 80 per cent. The division has been made in order to safeguard the Christian population of Lanao del Norte from the suordination **of the Muslim Government of Lunao del Sur.**

The Moros speak different dialects and possess verying subcultures. What binds them under the generic term Moros (from Moors denoting Muslims) is their common adherence to the Islamic religion.

The Perso-Arabic alphabet is used for writing. They have a number of manuscripts, consisting chiefly of religious works, books of magic etc.

Speaking of Moro character, Dr. Najeeb M. Salesby, first American school superintendent of the Moro Province, made the following observation: "The Moro is a Filipino Malayan of prominent type, reared in his infancy by Hindu Pandits and brought up to maturity under the care of Muhammadan priests. He rejected his (pre-Islamic) ideals as early as 1450 A.D. and has been for more than a century prior to the arrival of Legaspi, a faithful and devoted Muslim. He had laws, an organised government, an alphabet, and a system of education. He was chivalrous in his manners and received his friends with liberal hospitality, but he wasted no sympathy or kindness on his enemy. He would rather die than surrender. Such mettle is what makes the Moro brave, independent, and unyieding."

Besides the recent elements of Western influence, the general cultural life and social system of Moros show a conglomeration of the basic Malay traits, the ancient cultures of India, China and Arabia—the latest of which was brought by the peaceful introduction of Islam earlier than the advent of Christianity to the Philippines in 1521 A.D. when Magellan planted the first Christian Cross on Filipino soil. Both the religious and non-religious traits of native and Western cultures meet in Moroland to offer an interesting study in the history and social life of the people.

The Moros belong to both the Malayan race and the Filipino nation. As such their ancestors and their Christian brothers' ancestors shared more or less a uniform culture and social system prior to the introduction of Islam and Christianity to the Philippines. The Malay settlers introduced a system of patriarchal government called Barangay which no longer exists among the Christian Filipino as a result of Western influence.

The structure and function of the Maranaw organization, prior to the advent of the modern government, were more or less similar to those of the Barangay. The Moro system, however, received the influence of the Islamic concept of law and Government. The Maranaws today live under a socio-politico-religious organization in contrast to the national organization separating State and religion. It is, therefore, evident that the relations of both systems with the people are in conflict.

Present Position of the Muslims and their needs.

The strength and weakness of the Filipino Muslims arise mainly from their religious faith. Their strong faith in Islam. not merely as an inherited religion but as the last and best one revealed by God for the guidance of mankind, never ceased to fortify them from drifting away. It also gave them a sense of spiritual superiority that guaranteed their self-preservation as a community vis a vis tireless attempts by Christian Missions, peopled by able, skilful missionaries. indigenous as well as European and American, who are very active throughout the country and also have endless resources at their command.

But their long and heroic struggle for saving their souls under the peculiar circumstances tended to isolate them and generated an attitude of indifference and non-conformity to the government policies. Added to this the disinterestedness and negligence of the government towards them, until recently, kept the bulk of the Muslim population uneducated and backward, which drastically retarded social, economic and intellectual growth compared to their more progressive Christian neighbours. In other words, the bulk of the Filipino Muslims who have remained ignorant and backward is suffering from a superiority complex which begets an attitude of distrust and suspicion towards Government policies and retards their will-to-progress.

On the other hand, the small segment of the Muslim community, who was fortunate enough to receive modern education is suffering from an inferiority complex in respect of its own culture and tries to adopt the western Christian culture. Most of them are inclined to marry Christian girls and take to dancing and drinking. So also is the case with the younger generation born subsequent to the disappearance of hostilities between the two religious creeds. Thus, while the ignorant mass of the Muslim people hold fast to the Islamic ideology, the more enlightened section, who is likely to be the backbone of the Muslim society, is drifting away from Islam. The situation is, therefore, a paradoxical one which calls for immediate attention from all lovers of Islam.

The main reason which generates this anomaly lies in the lack of the basic knowledge of Islam among both the sections of the Muslim society and the absence of proper facilities to impart such knowledge which may have fortified the masses as well as the intelligentsia with a firm ground to preserve their firm belief. A further contributory reason is to be found in the strong impact of America and Western cultural on the younger generation of the Muslims who received modern education offered by the government since 1930, which aimed at the integration of the Muslims in the broader Philippine society. It would not, therefore, be too much to say that the solution of this paradox lies in the treatment of the root cause, i.e. imparting basic education regarding the tenets and institutions of Islam side by side with progress in modern education.

The New Awakening.

The year 1950 brought about a change of attitude towards Islam, particularly among the generation that had acquired education under the new but un-Islamic order and were then emerging as leaders of thought among the Muslims. The change was brought about by the visit of the Pakistani missionary, Maulana Abdul Aleem Siddiqi Al-Qadri. The impact of this visit jolted the Muslims and awakened them to the dangers of the loss of Islam in the area. His visit produced different types of reaction, some proper and some improper. Even isolated armed revolts cropped up which were ultimately put down.

Some of the newly surging forces, like the activities of the invigorated Muslim Association and the newly established Madresas and schools along modern lines, developed into useful instruments for defending Islam.

The spirit to defend and spread Islam among the Muslims acquired great impetus with new contacts with the Muslim world mainly through the activities of the Muslim Associaion of the Philippines. They acquired more and renewed inspiration from sympathies they got from Muslim countries, particularly from the U. A. R. that extended much needed help in the form of scholarships in the Azhar and other institutions of learning in Cairo, and at he same time sent to the Philippines teachers and preachers.

The Moro Problem.

The "Moro Problem" concerns the general relationship between the over two million Muslim Filipino population and the larger Philippine society or its government. The problem is discussed in its limited scope in so far as it concerns the Maranaws of Lanao Province who constitute a segment of the total Moro populaion. The historical background of this problem is also being discussed in order to understand the situation leading to the emergence of a desirable type of leadership in the context of social, cultural and political relationship between the Christian and Muslim groups.

Early Conflict With Western Forces.

Like the other Moro groups, the Maranaws were never subdued by the Spanish colonial administration in the Philippines. They had their first contact with the Spaniards about the year 1637 when Governor-General Sebastian Hurado de Corcuera launched a strong invasion against Sultan Dipatuan Kudarat, native ruler of Mindanao whose fortified settlement was on Illana Bay in Western Lanao. In 1639, Spanish explorers under the joint command of a military officer and a friar for "conversion" penetraed to Lake Lanao region. Due to the stubborn resistance of the natives, explorers were driven away from the mainland to the seacoast in 1640. History records that for a period of 250 years, no Spaniard was able to set foot again in the region. Spain's attempt to conquer. colorise, Christianise and Westernise Lanao never succeeded.

When the Spanish rule ended in the island, the United States occupation forces witnessed the Moros and the Spaniards still stalemated in the battlefield of Moroland.

In 1899, the American troops were ordered to relieve the Spanish garrison in Mindanao and Sulu. From that year to 1903 the garrison maintained peace and order. For a time they left the Moros alone in the management of their internal affairs in pursuance of a "policy of attraction and assimillation" by withholding any hostile move.

In Lanao, however, the Maranaws were defiant against the United States forces and gallantly met Colonel Frank D. Baldwin's troops in the Battle of Bayang, regarded as the "fiercest of the entire Philippine insurrection," due to heavy casualties on both sides. From 1903 to 1904, the then Captain John J. Pershing, who later became Military Governor of the Moro Province, broke the major resistance of the Maranaws and observed that they "are among the bravest and fiercest fighters in the world." This defeat of the Moros paved the way for the gradual establishment of a more friendly relation between the two forces under the new regime.

The advent of the American administration meant to the Maranaw a unification of their old tribal groups, once fighting among themselves, under single authority for the first time in their history. But the path toward mutual benefit was rough and thorny under the so-called "Moro Problem" which did not cease to exist down to the present day. The United States laid the foundation of progress but the object has not been totally achieved if we consider present-day conditions. Different formulae have been applied through the years under succeeding administrations Some solutions have been reached but much still remains to be done by the government and the people.

Review of the Problem:

An early study of Moro conditions up to the last days of the American regime in the Philippines brought out the following definition by Saleeby:—

> "By the Moro Problem is meant that method or form of administration by which the Moros and other non-Christians who are living among them, can be governed to their best interest and welfare in the most peaceful way possible and can at the same time be provided with appropriate measures for their gradual achievement in culture an dcivilization, so that in the course of a reasonable time they can be admitted into the general government of the Philippine Islands as a member of a republican national organization".

Considering the above definition in the light of present-day conditions, it can be observed that through gradual processes the problem had been partially solved, to wit: (1) the old open defiance against the government for "tribal freedom" ceased to exist and the Moros learned to live in comparative peace with other groups; (2) they were gradually brought under the government fold through the succeeding administrations of the Moro Province, the Department of Mindanao and Sulu, the Bureau of non-Christian Tribes, and the direct administration of the Philippines under the Hawes-Cutting Law and the Philippine Commonwealth. To-day, they are citizens of the Philippine Republic; and (3) although they are still retaining their Islamic religion and culture, much of Western culture had been diffused into their ways of life, except those elements which they consider harmful to their most rigid traditions.

The changes so far brought about, however, affected mainly the external mode of life. How deep have these new ways taken root in their lives is a question that one may pertinently ask in the context of Saleeby's recommendation for undertaking "appropriatt measures for their gradual achievement in (modern) culture and civilization." It is, therefore, of interest to consider present-day conditions as viewed by both Muslim and Christian Filipino leaders. Ex-Senator Domocao Alonto, who among Muslims now holds the most eminent position, once expressed himself as follows:—

> "The Moro Problem, as it is known and so called by the government and the nation at large, is nothing but the problem of integrating into the Philippine body politic the Muslim population of the country, and the problem of inculcating into their minds that they are Filipinos and that this Government is their own and that they are a part of it. It is regrettable that the Government to date has failed to inculcate into the minds of the Muslims the true and real meaning of Filipinism to enable them to be integrated into the body politic."

This view was further elucidated in a newspaper. Accocrding to Muslim Solon there were still Muslims who felt they were not Filipinos, that the government had not utilized the proper approach, referring not to the present administration alone but to the whole government since its establishment; that they knew that there was a Philippine government, but the majority believed it to be an imposition like "past Spanish and American Governments" in the Philippines; that in its totality it was fundamentally a social problem. As such it must be approached and avenues for solution explored sociologically.

On another occasion, the "Muslim Solon" spoke that the goal of the Moros was their real "integration into the Philippine body politic instead of the belief that the government is an imposition". Mr. Alanto suggested the necessity of creating an office like the defunct Commission for Mindanao and Sulu to look after the interest of non-Christians "as a good means to effect such integration". He further urged to bring them to the fold of the government by "introducing remedial measures towards their social, political, cultural, and economic advancement in order to come up to the level of their Christian brothers.

Indeed, true to the statement above, it is not enough that the Moro is granted full suffrage to participate in the affairs of the government, such as his vote during the national and local elections. In other words, it is the inner "feeling of being a Filipino" or integration of spirit which is absent in the attitude of an average Moro. It is also a sad thing to note that the majority of Christian Filipinos do not regard them as Filipinos, as evidenced by the statement of Under-Secretary Raul Manglupas of the Department of Foreign Affairs:

"We in the majority who dream of spreading our philosophy throughout Asia, will do well to begin to understanding our fellow Filipinos down south who share an identical culture with a great number of Asians in Indonesia, India, Pakistan, and the Arab World. They are our gateway to millions of our Asian brothers. The Christian majority should begin by giving the Moslem Filipinos the things they ask. They also call themselves Filipinos not Moros. Let us stop calling them the name which was given them, such as the notion that they are mostly pirates and juramentados. They ask for equality, understanding and patience.

Newspaper analyses of the situation are also worthy of consideratoin. An editorial of the Manila Times for October, 5, 1954, says:

The Moro problem is not so simple that it would be classified as a job solely for the law-enforcement authorities. It involves an understanding of the Moro way of life and the impact of Christian culture upon it, together with the many problems that arise as a result of the conflict of ideas and attitudes, customs and beliefs, between Christian settlers and the indigenous Moro population.

" It means a demolition of the old notions about the Moros—the man who runs amock at the slightest provocation—and the re-examination of his needs and the conditions in which he lives. Efforts should be made to attract Moros in Christian schools without prescribing any conditions that would compel them to abandon, say, their religious beliefs and customs."

In the same issue of the Manila Times, columnist Jaquin H. Roces commented as follows:—

"......It is a sad commentary on our attitude towards our Moro brothers that we readily spend millions in order to put a handful of dissident Moros into line, but we do not seem to care to give much attention to the majority of Moros who have always been peaceful in order to keep them in line......although they have remained for the most part peaceful, signs of passive resistance are visible everywhere. Now the Moros comprise one-tenth of our total population. But they certainly do not get one-tenth of our attention."

Roces subscribed to Alonto's idea for the creation of a "Commission under the Executive Branch of the Government... It would directly be in charge of the economic, social, political and cultural development of Mindanao and Sulu......Patterned after the former Bureau of non Christian tribes, although its scope would be much broader". Supporting the suggestion, no less a personality than the former Commissioner for Mindanao and Sulu, judge Teopisto Guingona, told the congressional committee "that an office dedicated to the promotion of the uplift of the Moro people should be established." The agencies that were assigned the task in the past were tested institutions for efficiency. Due to conflict of opinions and interests among political leaders, the suggestion to re-create a special agency was not well taken. The problem was analysed from the academic point of view but no tangible implementation worthy of credit was achieved. Roces asked: "Now this question is raised, May this task be accomplished without the need of creating a commission?".

A 1963 survey by the Senate Committee of National minorities listed problems in land, livelihood, education, health and transportation as the principal obstacles to incorporating the people into the body politic. The Manahan Report stated how the minorities are the victims of grave abuse and still graver neglect. Their lands have been usurped, their properties seized They have no roads and bridges that would link their reservations to the centres of population and government. School facilities are inadequate, health measures almost non-existent. And on top of all these is the unreasoning prejudice and hostility that the Christian Filipinos have for their non-Christian brothers. It is these factors, many scholars and social scientists believe that will keep the minorities of Mindanao, as well as the other regions of the Philippines, on a minority footing for many years to come.

At long last the Mindanao Development Authority came into being in June 1961 with the approval of the president of the Philippines. This Body declared itself as a policy of Congress to foster the accelerated and balanced growth of Mindanao, Sulu and Palawan region within the context of national plans and policies for social and economic development, through the leadership, guidance and support of the Government. The body was designed as a government corporation, created for:

(1) the purpose of drawing up the necessary plans for regional development;

(2) providing leadership in setting up pioneering or groundbreaking industrial and agricultural enterprises;

(3) co-ordinating and integrating the diverse efforts of the various public and private entities directly engaged in implementing plans and projects affecting power, manufacturing mining, transportation and communication, conservation, resettlement, education, extension work, health and other activities leading to the rapid socio-economic development of the region; and

(4) extending or facilitating the extension of financial, managerial and technical support to worthwhile industrial and commercial ventures within the region.

Placed at the helm of this magnificently planned and promising organization was Mayor Justiniano Ro. Borja, who is regarded as the Best Mayor of the Philippines. The law contemplates a total outlay of p.30 million yearly for ten years of a total of p.300 million of the Mindanao Development Authority.

In this connection the Philippine Government took a significant step with regard to the establishment of a State University known as Mindanao State University.

Mindanao State University.

The Mindanao State University in the Philippines, which was established by the Republic Act 1387 in 1955 and inaugurated on Nov. 18, 1962, was conceived as an instrument for the economic and social growth of Mindanao and the neighbouring regions. However, the Mindanao State University is somewhat a symbol of the Philippine Government's recognition of the Filipino Muslims' protest for neglect and an endeavour to integrate the 400,000 Maranaws in Lanao and the rest of Muslims living in Mindanao and Sulu into the national body politic.

The Mindanao State University offers 300 scholarships every year, based on results of competitive examinations given in Mindanao, Sulu and Palawan. The scholarship-holders represent the top 5 per cent of high school graduates from this area. The Muslim students being backward, naturally compete unsuccessfully with their more advanced Christian counterparts. Moreover, most of the Muslim students cannot afford the entire expenses of higher education.

In spite of all these facilities the Muslim population of the University, both with regard to staff and students, could not exceed 20 per cent of the total University body. Thus, the very purpose of establishing the University in the Muslim majority area seems to remain largely unfulfilled. If the Muslims of the region fail to take full advantage of the establishment of the University, they might lose Marawi city as well, as with the growing population of non-Muslims at the University campus, this majority province of the Muslims may also be reduced into a minority one.

In order to save the three million Muslims of the Philippines who are mostly concentrated in the three provinces of Lanao-del-Sur, Sulu and Cotabato, it is the duty of those Muslims who are fortunately independent in their own countries to help them in the following ways:—

1. By providing all possible books on Islamic literature in the University Library of Mindanao so that the educated Muslims should not be allowed to drift away from Islam.
2. To create a trust from which scholarships to poor and deserving Muslim students be given.
3. To establish a central Islamic cultural Centre with various branches in those areas where Muslims constitute the majority of the population.

The crux of the problem is this that in a democratic set-up the minorities cannot have proper safeguards for their religious, economic and political rights. The Muslims should be granted separate electorate so that they may have at least due representation according to the percentage of their population. They should also be granted due share in Government services, trade and commerce. Under the joint electorate system no minority can have due representation as is obvious from the fact that out of 100 members of the Senate not a single Muslim could be elected, whereas on the basis of their population there should have been at least 10 Muslim Senators.

In the end it can be safely concluded that the only solution of the problem of Filipino Muslims is the amalgamation of all the three provinces, viz., Lanao-del-Sur, Sulu and Mindanao Island into one Federal State on the pattern of U.S.A. constitution.

Muslims In India

Let us now turn our attention to the condition of Muslims—the largest minority in the world under the biggest democracy of secular India. In order to understand the treatment meted out to Muslims in India by the rulers and the public of that country, one has got to uuderstand the background of Hindu-Muslim relations in that country. In the first part of this book we have already dealt with the conditions of non-Muslims. Under very adverse circumstances, the Muslim rulers accorded the same liberal and generous treatment to the followers of polytheistic creeds in India as they had done to the believers of the revealed books. That should have worked out very well if the Hindus had accorded a reciprocial treatment in social matters to the Muslims who were their rulers On the other hand, the orthodox Hindus, in spite of their being the subject races of the Muslims, regarded the latter as untouchables. This humiliating treatment on the part of the conquered race should have opened the eyes of the Muslim rulers who, in such circumstances, should have thought of promoting the cause of Islam by carrying on Tableegh on a large scale in India and through this means created a majority of the Muslims there if they wanted to preserve their political supremacy in this country. In this behalf, as history bears testimony, the Muslim rulers adopted a policy of indifference towards their own religion with the result that Muslims remained in minority even in capital cities like Agra and Delhi. To make matters worse the Muslim rulers had deviated from the fundamental principles of Islam by introducing an undefined system of hereditary succession which brought about not only degeneration among the subsequent rulers but also sometimes wars of succession. In such circumstances, the result was obvious. With the weakening of the Central power, owing to incapable rulers after the death of the great Moghul Aurangzeb, the outlying provinces assumed independence with mutual rivalries among themselves. At this critical moment, a foreign power, the British, who came in the guise of merchants, assumed political power in India, and by 1856 their political hold over it was absolute and complete. The last effort made by the Muslims under the guidance of their last Moghul ruler, Shah Alam, to regain their power failed miserably against the well-equipped and well-trained army of the British. For some time both Hindus and Muslims contented themselves with their present condition but from the beginning of the tewentieth century, when a feeling arose among the Indians for self-government, the Hindus being in majority began to work on democratic lines so that they should take over power from the hands of the Muslims. In a natural way, with this object in view, the Hindus founded an organisation under the name of Indian National Congress in 1885 in order to rope in Muslims within the organisation. If the Hindus had adopted a policy of Iiberalism towards Muslims, the latter would have been entrapped in their device under the cloak of nationalism, but their narrow-mindedness came to the rescue of the Muslims.

As political power had been snatched away by the British from the hands of the Muslims, they were afraid of the latter. Hence the British followed the policy of persecution towards the Muslims and encouraged the non-Muslims. In such circumstances the Hindus expected the cooperation of the Muslims in their political designs. The Muslims had adopted a policy of aloofness and bycotted the English along with modern education. Thus they lagged behind their Hindu compatriots who were cooperating with the British and taking to English and modern education. At this stage arose a great leader in the person of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan. In the beginning he made sincere efforts to bring about amicable relations between the various communities of Islam, but closely watched its activities for three years and found that it was not liberal enough in its outlook and objectives. He therefore felt reluctant to identify himself or his people with it. About this time Urdu-Hindi language controversy had taken an ugly shape and even educated Hindus were favouring Hindi with Sanskrit script on communal grounds. This opened the eyes of Sir

Sayyid Ahmad Khan and people of his thinking. He was the first Muslim to realize and state that Hindus and Muslims were really two separate nations with separate and often conflicting economic, political and cultural interests. He was also keenly conscious that the Anglo-Saxon type of democratic Government was not suited to the conditions in India. This is what he said in a speech in the Council of the Governor-General of India :

> "The system of representation by election means the representation of the views and interests of the majority of the population. But, my Lord, in a country like India where caste distinctions still flourish, where there is no fusion of the various races, where religious differences, are still violent, where education in the modern sense has not made an equal or proportionate progress among all sections of the population, I am convinced that the introduction of the principle of election, pure and simple, for representation of various interests in the local boards and district councils would be attended with evils of greater significance than purely economic considerations....The larger community would totally override the interest of the smaller community."

He, therefore, began to organise the Muslims on a separate platform and succeeded to a large measure, in his life time, in his mission by organising the Muslims on one platform and equipping them with modern education coupled with Islamic ideals and bringing about rapprochement with the ruling nation i.e. the British, and securing from the latter certain safeguards for Muslim rights in the political field.

After the death of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan, his two lieutenants viz., Maulana Mohammad Ali and Viquarul Mulk followed in his footsteps. Under the able guidance of H.H. the Aga Khan, a Muslim deputation met Lord Minto, the Viceroy of India, at Simla, on October 1, 1906 and pressed for securing the right of separate electorate for Muslims. After receiving a favourable reply from him the Muslims founded an All India Muslim League on December 30th, 1906 in order to safeguard their interests and to achieve their objective of separate electorate for the Muslims. Luckily for Muslims they secured the right of separate electorate in the Reforms of Morley-Minto in 1909.

In order to alleviate the sufferings of the Muslims of Bengal, the British Government effected the partition of Bengal in 1905 so that the Muslims of East Bengal where they were in majority should be able to regulate their affairs according to their own requirements. But the extreme agitation and violent opposition of the Hindus compelled the British Government to annul this partition in 1911. The Muslims of India, henceforward fully realized that Hindus wanted to rule over the Muslims through a brute force of majority. Since the Morley-Minto Reforms which came into effect in 1909, the Muslims began to formulate their political plans on a separate basis. Securing the right of separate electroate for the Muslims was the first brick which was laid in the foundation of Pakistan. Subsequently at every stage, the Hindus opposed this right of the Muslims and never agreed to give it up. There were still some occasions where if the Hindus had shown a little foresight, the Muslims might have been content to live within united India. But as luck would have it, the intransigence of the Hindus enabled the Muslims to achieve their cherished object i e. establishment of Pakistan.

After Partition, Quaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah adopted a very liberal attitude towards the non-Muslims. While addressing the Constitutent Assembly in August 1947, he said: "If you can forget your past and work together in a spirit that every one of you no matter to what community he belongs, no matter what is his colour, caste or creed, is first, second and last citizen of this state with equal rights, privileges, obligations, there will be no end to the progress you will make. You are free. You are free to go to your temples, are free to go to your mosques or to any other places of worship in Pakistan. You can belong to any religion or caste, or creed. That has nothing to do with the business of the State."

The Muslims of Pakistan made it a cardinal point of their life to accord a very liberal and generous treatment to the Minorities which inhabit Pakistan not because their Goverment wanted this but their religion enjoins upon them to give full protection of life, property and honour of all those who live under the protection of Muslims. There might have been a few communal riots in the beginning in retaliation but after the Nehru-Liaquat Pact, the minorities in Pakistan have not only been leading a peaceful but prosperous life.

After this background let us turn to the other side of the picture. The Hindus could never reconcile themselves to the creation of Pakistan and always regarded it as the cutting of the sacred cow into two halves. How could the Hindus reconcile themselves to the partition of India when they had wider Imperialistic designs in order to take the place of Great Britain after the departure of the British from India?

After the transfer of power, when the Hindu nationalists found themselves the lords over a vast a population of over 440 million and abundant resources, they lost their heads. Instead of working for the amelioration of the condition of their poverty-stricken masses and developing friendly relations with neighbouring countries, they began to dream of becoming a World Power. The following quotations from Hindu nationalist leaders, thinkers and writers will amply reveal their intention of being an Imperialist Power in place of the British. Lala Hardayal said in his speech, as reported in Tej, of June 20, 1924: "I declare that the future of the Hindu race rests on four pillars: (1) Hindu Sangathan (Organisation), (2) Hindu Raj (Rule), (3) Shuddhi (conversion) of Muslims, and (4) Conquest and conversion of Afghanistan and the Frontier. So long as the Hindu nation does not accomplish these four things, the safety of our children and great grand-children will be ever in danger. If Hindus want to protect themselves they must conquer Afghanistan and the Frontier and convert all the mountain tribes." Again he said. "If there is awakening among the Hindu nation not only will the Hindu Raj come into being but the other aims, Shuddhi (conversion) of Muslims and conquest of Islam will also be achieved." Milap of June 23, 1925.

Even on the eve of partition and independence, while the Congress Party had agreed to partition, there were Hindu nationalists who were not reconciled to the existence of Pakistan and gave free expression to their views. For instance, Dr. Shyama Parashad Mukerjee said in an article published in the 'Organiser' on 3 July 1947: "The integrity of our motherland has been destroyed. This is a sad and tragic factor to which we cannot reconcile ourselves. Our aim must be to re-annex Pakistan to India." Diwan Chaman Lal, another prominent leader, said, "I am not a pessimist and I have full faith that this vivisection is temporary. All the same we must prepare the 300 million Hindus to be ready to die for the attainment of our goal."

Mr. Panikkar, a famous Indian historian, has given out the Indian designs in a more vivid manner. He advocates that 'India must have both a long term and short term policy in regard to nava matters'. The short term policy is to cooperate with the British in controlling the Indian Ocean; the long term policy is for India to control the Ocean and to make the Indian Ocean 'truly Indian'. Of the short term policy he says, "Britain has evacuated the Indian mainland but not the Indian Ocean. She has a line of defence of the Indian Ocean in British interests; the defence of the Indian Ocean must be a joint effort of India and Britain. It is for Britain and India to devise a machinery by which this aim can be effectively fulfilled. The solidarity of Indo-British interests will constitute the surest guarantee of Britain's authority and interest in the East."

As a result of the long-term policy, India would become mighty enough to control the Indian Ocean without British help. Speaking of the future targets, he says : "Unless, therefore, distant bases like Singapore, Mauritius, Aden and Cocotra are firmly held and the naval air arms is developed in order to afford sufficient protection to these posts, there will be no security or safety for India."

While the Hindu communalits were speaking of preparing themselves for future annexation of Pakistan, Pundit Nehru, as Leader of the Congress Party, made his 'Discovery of India' as a future world Power. In a speech delivered by him in 1946, he described the changed world situation in the aftermath of the world war as follows : "There are only two World Powers today. They are United States of America and the Soviet Union. Britain has become a third class Power. India and China with their populations and resources have the potentialities of becoming the third and fourth World Powers. There is no room for a fifth power."

Emphasising the importance of India's geographical position in the formulation of her foreign policy, Nehru said on March 23, 1947 : "Geography is a compelling factor and geographically she is so situated as to be the meeting point of Western and Northern and Eastern and South East Asia. Therefore, India has a special interest in areas close to her by land or sea. Nepal, Pakistan, Afghanistan, China, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia and Ceylon are, therefore, very important to India."

"India has vast strategic importance in view of her far flung position in ASIA AND THE Indian Ocean .....Therefore, India must control Singapore and Suez, the gateways to India. India's existence and independence stand imperilled if a hostile power occupies these key places."

We will now give facts and figures which would show how India has been engaged in a mad attempt to build its military strength. One aggression after another was committed by India since 1947. First it was Kashmir ; then, Junagadh, Manavadar, Mangrol, Hyderabad and Goa.

The Hindu nationalists are moved by deep-rooted anti-Islamic animus because they realise that the great force which could thwart their aspiration to build a Hindu World Power is Islam.

But in spite of the efforts of the Hindus to dominate and crush the Muslims, the latter carried on their struggle for a Home-land successfully and Pakistan came into existence ; West Pakistan on the one side and East Pakistan on the other stand as barriers to their expansionist policy towards the East or the West. And so since Independence, India has been describing Pakistan as its Enemy Number One. All the war preparations that are being made with the support of the U. S. A. and Soviet Union under the cloak of Chinese Bogey are meant firstly to try to eliminate Pakistan and then to expand unhindered for establishing a Hindu Empire which will extend from Suez to Singapore. Mr. Nehru himself confessed 'Most of our military thinking had been conditioned to the possibility of a war with Pakistan". While expounding his Five Year Plan, the Indian Defence Minister, Mr. Chavan, declared in March 1964: "We shall see that India becomes the grave of Pakistan" (Tribune, 15, March 1964). The first goal of Indian Imperialism is thus to try to destroy Pakistan.

Confident that her war preparations to give a knock-out blow to Pakistan were complete, India crossed the cease-fire line in the disputed territory of Kashmir. When U. N. did not move for days, Pakistan also crossed the cease-fire line to go to the rescue of the Kashmir freedom fighters. Thinking that the small Pakistan Air and Land Forces were locked up in Kashmir, India sprang a surprise and treacherous attack on Pakistan on September, 6, 1965 throwing all its seventeen year amassed armoured strength tank force and air power into the field and lost a good deal of them in the seventeen days Indo-Pak war. How numerical superiority and armed strength failed before the spirit of Islam of the Pakistan fighters are events of recent occurrence. They will be written in letters of gold in Islamic History. The valiant and brave men of Pakistan's Land, Air and Naval forces, by the grace of Allah, gave a smashing defeat to the aggressive forces of India which had been and is a threat not only to Pakistan but to the whole of South Asia, from Suez to Singapore.

The Indian Leaders agreed to Partition because, in their opinion, Pakistan could not survive economically. Maulana Abul Kalam Azad observe how India's Deputy Prime Minister (Sardar Patel) was convinced that the new state was not viable and could not last. He thought that the acceptance of Pakistan would teach the Muslim League a bitter lesson. Pakistan would collapse in a short time and the Provinces which had seceded from India would have to face untold difficulties and hardship. Even Mahatma Gandhi expressed such hope, though in milder terms, in some of his prayer meetings in June 1947.

More importantly the Indian leaders were all the more confirmed in this view by the confident assertion of several top Indian and foreign economits that Pakistan was far from viable. No wonder, the Indians fondly hoped that Pakistan, especially in its truncated form and in view of its geographical contradictions and economic difficulties would not survive more than six months and might even be still born.

In pursuance of such thinking, India took a series of measures which might look inexplicable on the face of them but were meant, in Field Marshal Auchinleck's words "to cripple and thwart the establishment of Pakistan as a viable, independent nation."

With this object in view, the Indian Congress Leaders made a systematic effort to beguile the Hindus of West Pakistan to migrate en bloc to India so that this part of Pakistan may be economically crippled. But this sinister move of theirs proved a blessing in disguise as the vacuum so caused was filled by the persecuted Muslims of India who had migrated to Pakistan. Moreover the persecution of the wealthy class in Kathiawar, Junagarh and Bombay obliged it to take shelter in Pakistan. While on the one hand the Muhajir middle class from India got an opportunity to settle down in Karachi and Sind, on the other millionaires from India built up the Industrial Section of the country and provided employment to the poor refugees.

When India failed in all its attempts to cripple or finish Pakistan, it devised a systematic method of persecuting the poor Muslims of India either to convert them to Hinduism or to merge them culturally into Hinduism under the cloak of integration, or to frighten them to such an extent that they should leave the country and migrate to Pakistan.

The Indian Muslims are being persecuted on three fronts—cultural, economic and religious.

Cultural persecution :- Even the Congress Goverment which has been in office with the support of the Nationalist Muslims would like the Muslims to lose their distinct Islamic culture and merge it into Hinduism known as National Culture under the cloak of national integration. The greatest vehicle of expression of one's culture is its language. Urdu, which had been evolved by the combined efforts of both Hindus and Muslims in India and has been the dominant language of North India and in fact the spoken tongue written in Persian script, is being eliminated. In its place Hindi, heavily Sanskritised and nearly incomprehensible to Muslims, is being patronised. Every effort on the part of the Muslims to get Urdu recognised as a regional language in U.P., Bihar and Delhi, where it is spoken, has failed to evoke an y response from the Government. Even today Indian movies, beyond any doubt the strongest secular force in the country, are more in Urdu than in Hindi. This is an evident fact that the majority of Indians follow the pictures more in Urdu than in Hindi. But the language has now been banished for all official purposes and discouraged in the schools. This places Muslims at a disadvantage in approaching the Government or competing for its jobs. And the rejection of their language is taken by them to be a rejection by Hindus of their right to a place in Indian life.

Jawahar Lal Nehru, who elaborated this synthesis in his testament "Discovery of India", was himself one of its finest products, a high caste Hindu by birth with a strong feeling for what the Muslims had contributed to India. Despite Nehru, the common culture has been under assault since indpendence. Books have been written seeking to show that the Taj Mahal, one of India's glories, was really more Hindu than Muslim. Indian history has been re-written from the Hindu point of view to describe the Muslims who ruled India for 700 years as foreigners, looters and tyrants; and Hindu free-booters like Shiva Jee are being shown as heroes and liberators of India. Among the national heroes who fought and attained independence, not a single name of a Muslim is shown.

The Congress Government has been trying to change the Muslim character of Aligarh Muslim University, the home of Indian Muslim Culture. This was the only educational institution which was open to Muslims. But now, through a recent Ordinance, the autonomy of the University has been taken away. For all intents and purposes, it is being controlled by the Indian Government. Previously, the Vice-Chancellor was elected by the all-powerful Court, which has now been reduced to a figurehead. The nominated vice-chancellor has been invested with vast powers. The Executive Council which included all the Muslim members and was the Chief Executive Body has been reduced to a subservient position. Even the number of Muslims in technical institutions, viz; Engineering College and Medical College has heen fixed at par with that of the Hindus and the form of salutation prevalent among Muslims all over the world is being discouraged as the Muslim President of India himself is setting an example of saluting the Prime Minister and others with folded hands like the Hindus. These are the subtle ways or steps taken by the Congress Government to change the culture of the Muslims and merge it into that of Hindus.

Coming to the other side of the picture, what do the orthodox Hindus think about the Muslims? Recent utterances of Gowalkar, chief of the fascist RSS, are a warning that dark forces of reaction are out again to disrupt communal harmony and peace and create dangerus conflagrations. The RSS chief has been inspiring his followers with his communal cry of a Hindu Rashtra and declared that India is a land of Hindus. His basic policy depends upon the exclusivist concept of Hindu religion which is what has been described as "The blood and soil concept religion". This concept means that India is for the Hindus and Hindus are for India. It is under this principle that the Hindus regard the followers of any other religion who may happen to inhabit India as both foreigners and traitors. According to them all Arabs, Turks, and Persians who have been living in this sub-continent for centuries together were no more than looters, killers and oppressors in the days of Muslim rule in India and are now foreigners and traitors. Socially and culturally Hinduism believes in absolute isolation. Its logical consequence, therefore, is to exterminate all non-Hindus of the sub-continent and primarily, of course, the Muslims because they are the second largest group after the Hindus.

Economic Persecutions

The Hindu's aim is to ensure that so long as Muslims remain in India they should be economically crippled and denied access to gainful employment and governmental posts. Those few selected Muslims who are given high posts or social status in India, are, at best tolerated and enjoy these positions on sufferance and even so primarly because India can use them as show-pieces of her so-called tolerance. Any objective study of the actual figures of Muslims who are either recruited for Government employment or in trade and Industry, or selected as representatives in the Provincial and National Assemblies, will confirm all this statement. The facts and figures as published in the New York Times by its New Delhi correspondent will prove this contention without any doubt that under the cloak of secularism India is putting through a systematic policy of denying the Muslims opportunities of economic well-being. A recent survey showed that barely two per cent of Govt. officials at the highest level were Muslims. Outright discrimination is more clearly shown ont he lower rungs of the bureaucracy. Muslims account for less than one half or one per cent of the clerks and messengers in the ministries of the Central Government.

Mr. Liaquat Ali Khan being apprehensive of the Muslim minority in India hastened to Delhi and met Mr. Nehru. Through mutual discussions with regard to the safety of minorities both in India and Pakistan and agreement known as Liaquat-Nehru Pact was signed in 1950, which reads as follows :

"The Government of India and Pakistan solemnly agree that each shall ensure, to the Minorities throughout its territory, complete equality of citizenship, irrespective of religion, a full sense of security in respect of life, culture, property and personal honour, freedom of movement within each country and freedom of occupation, speech and worship, subject to law and morality. Members of the minorities shall have equal opportunity with members of the majority community to participate in the public life of their country, to hold political or other office, and to serve in their country's civil and armed forces. Both Governments declare these rights to be fundamental and undertake to enforce them effectively."

After this agreement, Pakistan has been honouring it although the Indian Government has broken it more than six hundred times when communal disturbances occurred in India. One would have naturally expected that after this agreement communal riots would have decreased both in intensity and frequency, but the undeniable fact is that, as the years have gone by, Hindu tyranny and violence not only did not decrease in intensity and frequency, but the most serious riots occurred in January and February, 1964. In the early months of 1964, widespread Hindu communal fury was let loose on the Muslims in Calcutta and West Bengal in general and in Assam, Bihar and Orissa in particular.

Although the pretext used for these massacres was the mild demonstrations which occurred in Khulna, East Pakistan, over the theft of the sacred relic of the Holy Prophet in Kashmir, there is abundant evidence to show that these massacres were preplanned. For example Mr. J.R.D. Tata speaking at a public meeting soon after the riots said :

"There was enough evidence in the very fact that identical events flared up simultaneously at the same hours on the same day at Jamshedpur and in places like Rourkela to show that there was, apart from anything else, an organized plot of looting, arson and murder." (The Statesman May 9, 1964).

On this occasion even Hindu papers like the Patrika admitted :

"Stern measures have been and continue to be taken but they are proving ineffective. Despite police and military patrolling......... members of minority community are living a nightmarish existence."

About the killing of Muslims in Calcutta, even the Hindustan Times could not help crying out: "The present avalanche of arson and looting in Calcutta appears to be the worst in the troubled history of that city."

In many ways, it certainly was the worst. But the most unfortunate and horrifying feature was that young and enlightened college students of India played the role of assassins and dacoits. And the Hindustan Times admits it clearly enough: A bad feature of Calcutta's nightmare this time is the readiness with which students have joined in the general mayhem. It may be that there has been too much leniency in dealing with them in the past.

However, the real tragedy is depicted in the words of Syed Badruddoja, a Muslim member of the Lok Sabha from West Bengal. He spoke in a voice choked with emotion and suffering, and fearlessly declared that happenings in Calcutta and West Bengal had been minimised by the Govt. and suppressed by the Press. More heinous crimes had been perpetrated on the poor and innocent Muslims than what had come to light.

During a session of the Indian Parliament in June 1962, the same gentleman while pleading for justice and mercy for the Indian Muslims, had said, "Even in this secular democracy of India, in this fast expanding, growing, developing socialist pattern of society, Mussalmans and all other minorities would have no quarter, no shelter, no recognition, no appreciation, no encouragement, no facilities, no opportunities for self-expression—politically, socially, culturally, economically. And even physically they would be at the mercy of forces of reaction. Mussalmans have been pursued to the bitter end. They have been tortured with every refinement of cruelty and barbarous savagery."

The statement by S.P. Sihna, Senior Advocate, made on the occasion of Minorities convention held by Muslim Majlis and published in Radiance 10, 1968 throws ample light on the economic plight of the Muslims in India. He says, "A single word 'discrimination' sums up their grievances. It assumes protean shapes and myriad forms. Whenever the last of successful candidates appears relating to any of the services, there is no Muslim name at all. If there are any, the disparity only emphasises the discrimination. Their lot is most unenviable in the Army, the Police and other essential services.

"The economy of the country being in the hands of about a dozen business houses, let New Delhi try to find out how many Muslims are working in the concerns of the Tatas, Jaipirias, Birlas, Goenkas and Singhanias, etc. The Tatas might have a few Muslim chaprasis but the rest will not make even that mistake. The recent disturbances at Industrial centres like Jamshedpur, Rourkela and Ranchi, to mention but a few, have a tendency to scare away even the few Muslims belonging to the lowest strata.

"The lot of the Muslims is worse than that of the Harijans. This is due to two factors. They are the main target of the Jana Sangh fury and till recently, when Mrs. Gandhi woke to her sense of responsibility, New Delhi paid no heed to this cry. It took them for granted."

Religious Persecution

Partition of the country sounded a death knell for the Indian Muslims. Before they could adjust to the changed circumstances, bloody riots one after another, in quick succession, made them unnerved and shook them to their foundations.

Their leaders began to leave them one by one for Pakistan, leaving them in the lurch. A large slice of intellectuals as well as well-to-do Muslims quitted the country as a precautionary measure to safeguard their life, honour and future prospects. Hence the Indian Muslims who by then had become leaderless had to suffer the loss of persons of count in the community.

On the other side, the communal elements who by the time had gained in strength began to decry and denounce anything and everything Muslim. Their plea was, and ironically still is, that as the Partition of the country has been effected on communal basis, the Muslims forfeited the right to live in the country. As a corollary to it the country is the exclusive preserve of the Hindus only. This theory got currency in the country and consequently floodgates of Muslim miseries and harassment were opened. Gandhiji was assassinated as he was a hurdle in the way of reactionaries who in their enthusiasm to Hinduise politics and militarise Hinduism did not like to leave anything on chance. They were determined and are still doggedly after the minorities, especially the Muslims. The loyalty of Muslims was doubted and their bonafides suspected. Their culture, language, institutions and even life became insecure. Hence it is of little surprise that hundreds of riots have taken place and not a single criminal has been executed.

Since 1954 about 1,500 Indians, some 1,250 of them Muslims, have been killed in communal riots According to officials that is about four times the toll for the previous fourteen years.

For nearly two years after the war with Pakistan there was little conmunal strife. Then in August last year at least 170 Muslims, some say at least twice as many, were killed in the industrial centre of Ranchi in Bihar after Hindu domonstrators opposing any concession to Muslims on the status of Urdu, the language spoken by them there, clashed with Muslim students. Most of the dead were employees of the state-owned Heavy Engineering Corporation who were trapped and slaughtered with their families in their Government supplied homes. So far so that this year there have been communal orgies in Meerut, Calcutta, Allahabad, Karimgunj, Mangalore, Hyderabad, Aurangabad and Nagpur, resulting in the loss of more than 100 lives. The proportion of Muslim dead to Hindu dead has been at least five to one and sometimes ten to one.

Muslims and many others believe that the riots which are invariably accompanied by looting and arson, are part of a deliberate compaign to terrorise them. "It is time we stopped talking about communal riots," remarked Enaith Habibullah, a retired Major General of the Indian Army. "These are massacres like the pogroms against the Jews. The aim is to push us back into ghettos."

That at least is the result in Ranchi more than a year after the riot there. About 1,000 Muslim employees of the Heavy Engineering Corporation are still huddled together in a dormatory they have been using as a refugee camp.

A number of Ranchi Muslims left for Pakistan, as did many of their friends and relations. Each major riot precipitates a small exodus in this way

Future of Muslims in India

The future of Muslims very much depends upon the happy and cordial relations between the two countries, India and Pakistan. It chiefly depends upon the settlement of the question of Kashmir. So far as Pakistan is concerned she has been very eager to settle all the disputes including that of Kashmir with India. But it seems the latter is determined to keep her illegal hold on Kashmir. She has gone back on all her promises which she made before U.N.O. and has so far defied all the resolutions passed by that august and supreme body known as the Security Council of U.N.O. By the very common argument that wherever the majority people constituted Hindus that state must go to India, India forcibly annexed Hyderabad, Junagadh and Manawadar although the latter two states had opted for Pakistan, and the former was granted an autonomous position by India herself. Under the same analogy Kashmir should have come over to Pakistan. As a last a resort the dispute about Kashmir could be solved or can still be solved if a free and fair plebiscite under the aegis of U.N.O is held in Kashmir and this was the solution which was decided by the Secutity Council of U.N.O. But India's intransigence would not allow the settlement of this question. Hence communal tension in India would continue.

It is most unfortunate that the conscience of the Muslim world (excepting Pakistan) has not yet awakened to the realization of the miseries and persecutions of Indian Muslims who have always stood for the cause of all Muslims outside Indo-Pakistan sub-continent. But how long would the Muslim world keep on sleeping on this problem? The day would come soon when it would realize the magnitude of the problem of Indian Muslims, and put pressure on the Indian Government to accord them the same fair treatment which is meted out to Hindus in Pakistan under similar conditions.

But the real solution lies with the Indian Muslims themselves. If they are united they form the largest single party in India. In the beginning, they could not do so because all of a sudden all their leaders and intellegentsia had left for Pakistan and those who were left in India had faith in the Congress Government of which they were the active and influential members. But what the Congress did was to appoint a few influential Congress Muslims on big posts but failed to safeguard even the legitimate interests of the Indian Muslims. On other hand the orthodox Hindus like Jan Sangh and RSS gathered strength and began to finish Muslims by letting loose hell on them in the form of communal riots.

After a long suffering, Muslim leaders, including those of the Congress, were disillusioned and thought of organising themselves on a separate platform. The first step was taken when an all-India Muslim Majlis-i-Mushawarat with Dr. Syed Mahmud as its chairman, was established. The formation of Mushawarat was a turning point in the whole span of two decades of trials and tribulations, stresses and strains of Indian Muslims. The Majlis passed the following resolutions :—

"We decide that the Muslims should give up weeping and wailing and should try to regain their lost energies and strive for a change in the prevailing precarious conditions. We also advise them that they should try to extricate their Country from the morass of mutual conflict, internal decay and lack of confidence, and should try to restore the atmosphere of true coufidence and lasting national sobidarity."

U.P. Mushawarat went one step further by supporting a number of candidates in the last general elections under its moving spirit, Dr. A. J. Faridi. In U.P. 38 Mushawarat-backed candidates for assembly and two M. Ps. got elected. The U.P. move is being watched and debated in Bihar papers too and majority of Muslims are for a political party of their own. This too cannot be denied that in democracy it is essential to elect right type of candidates who can represent the Muslim case. Besides, unless they organise themselves and make their existence felt, no power on earth can take them or their grievances seriously.

It is still time for the All India National Congress to reform its party in such a way as to restore the confidence of Muslims and assure them by its actions that it would safeguard their legitimate and fundamental rights. This can only be done if separate electorate is granted to the Muslims or at least proportional representation in legislative and Government posts is guaranteed.

If the Congress fails to enlist the sympathies of the Muslims it is likely to lose political power. If Muslims get themselves organised as a solid block, which, I am sure they would, being the best Muslims all over the world, they will form constitutionally the balancing factor in the formation of any Government in India. I am afraid, if they join hands either with the Communist or Socialist party it will neither be in their own interest nor in the interest of the Indians and their patrons, U.S.A.

The Muslims in Kashmir

It was an evil day for the people of Kashmir when Imamuddin, its governor appointed by the Emperor of Delhi, was ousted by the British and this paradise on earth was sold in 1846 to Gulab Singh, the opportunist Dogra, who had risen from a watchman at Mangla to the post of a Wazir of the Sikhs. It is hard to imagine the statesmanship of the British to sell Kashmir for a paltry sum of Rs. 75 lacs to Gulab Singh who, according to John Lawrence, was a man about whom 'Nobody has ever yet been heard to say a good word' and of whom Herbert Edwards, who had spent long hours with him, had to say "The worst native I have ever come into contact with; a bad king, a miser and a Liar."[1] This all-powerful depositc usurpur had no aim in life except to lead a life of luxury at the cost of the down-trodden people of Kashmir. They had to bear all the taxes but no portion of the income derived from them was spent on their amelioration. All the Government posts were reserved for the Hindus, both Brahman and Dogra; education was also confined to the same fortunate classes and except as labourers and workmen they could not exist in the metropolis. They paid, in addition to land revenue, hearth tax, goat tax, cow tax and taxes of various names. Fertile lands were confiscated by the Rajah, his kinsmen and other influential Hindus. The Muslims were only tenants. They had no political representation and as such no voice in the Government of the country. Driven like mute animals they were forced to live sub-human life.

The Maharajah ruthlessly persecuted millions of Kashmiris only because they believed in the Unity of God in contrast to his

---

1. Thomson and Garret, Rise and Fulfilment of British Rule in India, Central Book Depot, Allahabad, 1962 P. 344.

faith in hundreds of gods. The leaderless and rudderless Kashmiris drifted with neither any objective nor any hope of early deliverance. Being persecuted in their own land, many of them migrated to the neighbouring land of British India where not only were they allowed to eke out a little earning but also to give expression to their feelings of pain and agony due to the fact that they had left their kith and kin in abject misery and slavery.

The persecuted Kashmiris cried in vain in Kashmir as their voices were always stifled before they could reach the world outside. But when the refugees from Kashmir raised their voice of resentment from the newly found soil of the Punjab through the All India Muslim Kashmir Conference, they were heard far and wide. More voices of resentment joined in and eventually resulted in a tumultuous uproar from within the Valley of Kashmir.

The All India Muslim Kashmir Conference came into existence with a view to emancipating the enslaved Kashmiris in their own homes where they were only existing in most miserable and pitiable conditions.

The formation of All India Muslim Kashmir Conference and its activities in British India, gave the necessary moral support to Kashmiris and they began to start stirring gradually. In the beginning they raised their voices of resentment in a subdued manner and then a bit loudly. The Maharaja and his Hindu Advisers got perturbed as they could never imagine that the five million slaves purchased for seventy-five lacs of rupees would dare to ask for any human treatment; particularly at a time when the sharp bayonets of the seller were still there to give protection to the mighty landlord. No serf in history had been so openly sold like cattle and then completely subdued and yet on the strength of the voice of a few who had managed to get out of the clutches of the fiendish ruler these purchased serfs dared to ask for concessions Groaning under the weight of one of the most abominable tyrannies in history, the anger of the long-suffering people of Kashmir erupted in 1931 in open protest against Dogra rule.

After a mass meeting on June 21, 1931, and the arrest of a leader in Srinagar, a crowd gathered outside the jail, and was met with merciless firing (July 13, 1931) which killed twentyone and wounded at least a hundred.

Once the martyrs' blood had flowed in the streets of Srinagar, the movement gathered momentum, and under the brave leadership of Sheikh Abdullah, civil liberties were won for the downtrodden people during the next thirty years.

People of the Punjab were too near to the scene of these tragedies. They crossed into Kashmir in thousands and over 30,000 of them ended up in the jails of the Maharaja. The British Indian Government had to step in and the tension decreased. As a result of these occurrences a new political organisation came into being in 1932 called All Jammu and Kashmir Conference which could function within Kashmir itself. The sacrifices made by Kashmiris gained them the permission to voice their feelings and relate their grievances, if nothing else. The All India Congress, a secular body in name but thoroughly Hindu dominated, feeling sympathetic with the Hindu rule of Kashmir but ever watchful to fish in troubled waters, engineered the setting up of a rival political body in 1939 known as National Conference headed by Sheikh Muhammad Abdullah, the able and energetic patriot. He was to regret his alliance with this organisation but that was to come much later and at a time when there was no possibility left for him to retrace his steps. In 1946, when the rest of the sub-continent was striving for freedom, in Kashmir too Sheikh Abdullah launched a Quit-Kashmir movement against the Dogra rulers, but was promptly jailed.

The next big event concerning the lives of Kashmiris was the independence of India and the formation of two independent Dominions of Pakistan and India.

The Princely States had no power to make peace or war or to negotiate or communicate with any foreign state. Even their internal sovereignty was restricted by the right of the Crown Representative to intervene in their affairs, for example for the benefit of State administration, the welfare of the ruler or the people, or of India as a whole, and also for giving effect to international commitments. In short, the Princely States, including Jammu and Kashmir, were more or less protectorates under the British Crown.

Let us now recall the change which took place in the status of the Princely States when British rule in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent came to an end.

When partition of the sub-continent into the two sovereign States of India and Pakistan was agreed upon, the U.K. Government declared that the Paramountcy of the Crown over the Princely States would lapse on the day the sub-continent became independent. The States would then be free to accede either to India or to Pakistan. The Viceroy and Governor-General, Lord Mountbatten, who represented the Suzerain—the King of the United Kingdom and Emperor of India—however, advised the Princes of India on 25th July 1947 that in deciding the question of accession, they must pay due regard to the communal composition, the wishes of their peoples and the geographical location of their States. He warned, "You cannot run away from the Dominion Government which is your neighbour, any more than you can run away from the subjects for whose welfare you are responsible."

The basis of Partition of the British Empire in India, as set forth in the statement of the then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on 3rd June 1947, was that Pakistan would be constituted by the contiguous Muslim-majority areas in the North-West and the North-East of the sub-continent, and India would comprise contiguous non-Muslim-majority areas.

It was thus universally assumed that, following the basis adopted for Partition, Princely States with a Muslim majority in population contiguous to Pakistan would accede to Pakistan.

Thus in the case of Jammu and Kashmir, the position was crystal clear. Here, although the ruler was a Hindu, 77 per cent of the population was Muslim. The State territory was contiguous to Pakistan. Political, economic, strategic, cultural, geographical and other considerations, all made accession to Pakistan in natural course.

The Government of India and the Indian National Congress were in full agreement with the advice that Lord Mountbatten had given to the Indian rulers on the subject of accession. Had this advice, which was based on the principle underlying Partition, been honoured by India, or had India been consistent even in her own conduct on the issue of accession, there would have been no dispute regarding the three States of Jammu and Kashmir, Junagadh and Hyderabad.

The Nawab of Junagadh, a Muslim ruler, acceded to Pakistan, although the State had a majority of Hindu population. The Government of India protested in the strongest terms. Their view was that on the lapse of British Paramountcy, sovereign rights in an Indian State reverted to its people. A Muslim ruler could not speak for his non-Muslim population. In their telegram dated 22nd September 1947, the Government of India considered the acceptance of Junagadh's accession by Pakistan as an encroachment of Indian sovereignty and territory. They characterized it as "a clear attempt to cause disruption in the integrity of India by expanding the influence and boundaries of the Dominion of Pakistan in utter violation of principles on which Partition was agreed upon and effected." Subsequently, the Indian army invaded Junagadh and the State was occupied by India by force.

In the matter of Hyderabad, a Hindu majority State of the size of France and having a population of 15 million with a Muslim ruler, the conduct of the Government of India was also inspired by similar considerations. The Nizam, a Muslim ruler, did not wish to accede either to India or to Pakistan. He wanted instead to enter into special treaty relations with the Government of India in order to preserve a measure of independence for his State and was prepared to hold a plebiscite on this issue. That the Nizam, a Muslim ruler of a Hindu-majority State, should refuse to accede to India, even though he was prepared to let his people decide this question by means of a plebiscite, was intolerable to the Indian Government. In September 1948, the Indian Army invaded Hyderabad and after defeating the Nizam's army, occupied his State and subjected it to military rule.

The Indian stand therefore was that a State with a majority of Hindu population had no choice but to accede to India, even if its Muslim ruler did not wish to do so. In such a case, the Government of India were not prepared to entertain the very conception of a plebiscite. It followed from the Indian thesis that a State whose majority was Muslim, had no choice other than to accede to and must be deemed to have acceded to Pakistan, even though its Hindu ruler might decide otherwise.

When it came to Kashmir, however, India abandoned this thesis. Here was the case of a Hindu ruler offering to accede to India, in spite of the fact that 77 per cent of the State's population was Muslim.

The Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir being confident of the support of the Indians and their patron, the Viceroy of India, did nothing of the sort. The latter had, during his personal visit, given a hint that the Maharaja was a free agent and would get full support for whatever he decided. Relations between the Viceroy of India and Nehru family appear to have been very cordial. Lt. General Kaul, who was very close to Nehru, writes, "In fact a great friendship developed between their families and had many things in common; they were handsome, aristocratic and talented. Mountbatten and Nehru were friends because they were similar personalities. Lady Mountbatten and Nehru were close because she filled a void in his lonely life."[1] In such circumstances the Maharaja sat still but to lull Pakistan into inaction he concluded a standstill agreement with the newly formed Government of Pakistan.

No doubts would have arisen of the complicity of the representative of the British Crown if the Maharaja had not started constructing a bridge on the Ravi to link the State with Gurdaspur, a district with clear Muslim majority[2]

How did the Maharaja know that the Boundary Commission under Radcliffe, a British Judge, was to award Gurdaspur to India?

The basic principle on which the partition of the Punjab had been accepted had been given up to placate India by giving her an access to Jammu and Kashmir.[3] Lord Birdwood has very frankly said: "It is also fair to Pakistan to recall again that had the Gurdaspur district not been awarded to India, India would have certainly never have fought a war in Kashmir." He goes on to say, "In the Lahore division the Gurdaspur district carried a Muslim majority. A glance at the map will show that had this district as a whole been awarded to Pakistan, the position of the troops landed by air in Kashmir from India would have been quite untenable."[4]

---

1. (Genl. Kaul, The Untold Story, p. 86).
2. The 1941 census report shows that Gurdaspur district had 52 per cent Muslim population.
3. Birdwood", A Continent Decides", Robert Hale Ltd., London. 1953. p, 26.
4. Ibid p.235.

The Maharaja had one Muslim battalion in an army of 13 battalions. In order to forestall any action from them due to his decision not to accede to Pakistan, he ordered the disbandment of this battalion. These, however, were not the only Muslim soldiers in the State. There were thousands veterans of the two World wars and they took up arms in defence of their rights of freedom and option to accede to any one of the two newly created dominions. The Muslim Conference supported these patriots and there was an open rebellion throughout the State. There was civil disobedience in Poonch where the Dogra army was routed by the volunteer Muslim forces as in other places, particularly in Mirpur, Muzaffarabad, Bagh and Gilgit. An appeal was sent to the neighbouring districts and the tribal areas of Pakistan for help in men and material.

Poonch in fact constituted a subsidiary separate state and the Maharaja exercised only a nominal control over its affairs. The population of Poonch was predominantly Muslim and of a martial stock. These men, most of whom had only recently returned from the Second World War, rose against the atrocities of the Dogra Army. Around these men was formed the hard core of Azad Kashmir Army. They constitute an excellent fighting material but most of them had not any experience of command and control of large bodies of men and none had risen to higher ranks of the Indian Army. They, therefore, lacked the ability to organise themselve into a wellknit field army. In spite of it the Maharaja's army was no match for them and they were able to liberate practically the whole of the State of Poonch and besiege the capital city of Poonch itself. Their numbers soon swelled to 300,000 and they took control of the whole area except the valley of Kashmir and major part of Jammu.

The Maharajah realising his position, left Srinagar and took refuge in Jammu but the henchmen of his government remained active in Srinagar itself and the valley. Simultaneously, while trying to avoid coming to any understanding with Pakistan, the Kashmir Government started a country-wide campaign of "systematic persecution of the Muslim population." It started on 26th August at Bagh in Poonch when Muslims were set on and killed by the State troops for contravening orders which had forbidden the celebration of Pakistan Day on the 14th August. It continued and increased in tempo with the infiltration of members of

R.S.S., Akali Sikhs and the I.N.A. into Jammu province in October, and culminated with the massacre of two crowded convoys of Muslim evacuees who had been promised safe conduct to Pakistan. On 5th November the convoys drew up at a village on the Kannu-Kathua road, and were set on by armed bands, their Sikh escorts joining in the slaughter. The overall result of resort to their depraved morality was to cause some 500,000 Muslims to flee from their homes, about 400,000 seeking shelter in Azad territory and at least 100,000 dribbling over to Pakistan.

News of the massacre of Muslims in Jammu and Kashmir reached Pakistan and immediately produced echoes of very violent nature. Volunteers started assembling and managed to reach Kashmir. The tribes became restive too. The administration of the Frontier Province and Tribal areas was still in British hands and although serving Pakistan the British officers were keen to keep a neutral attitude in this very vital issue. "Sir George Cunningham was engaged in making desperate efforts to dissuade Mohmand Maliks and others from entering Kashmir. But the seed had been sown, and control at that stage was out of question. This was not surprising in view of the absence of any formed units of Pakistan Army at that time."

The units of Pakistan Army were still in the embryo state, being collected from all over India and abroad and were still arriving in small pockets. Even if Pakistan had wished to invade Kashmir it could not mobilise enough strength to do so. The Poonch veterans, however, had collected enough funds and contacted the rifle factories in tribal areas to purchase arms and ammunition. The neighbouring districts of Jhelum and Rawalpindi came forward and helped in collecting rations, clothes, blankets and transport animals for use of Azad Army. Even far away town-dwellers of Lahore, Multan, Dacca and Karachi did not wish to lag behind and contributions in money and material started pouring in.

The State authorities had realised that help might be forthcoming from Pakistan. They had, therefore, closed all routes into Kashmir and destroyed the ferries across river Jhelum. Those who dwell on the banks of rivers know how to cross them and very soon contact was re-established with the outside world. Gradually the State troops were rounded up in Poonch and Muzaffarabad and regular flow of men and material started reaching the Azad forces there. Units which had been allotted to

Pakistan and the Muslim elements of Units which had remained in India, had a good sprinkling of men from Poonch, Mirpur and Bhimpur. There were units which were entirely recruited from these areas. The news of disturbances and atrocities committed by State troops reached these men who were still in various contonments of India. They could not remain dumb spectators to what was happening to their families. They all flocked to join the ranks of the Azad forces.

However good fighters they were, without adequate high command, they could not be a match against a well organised and well supported army. As long as it was the Dogra army of the Maharaja opposed to them they did well. They had the moral support of the hurriedly formed Government of Azad Jammu and Kashmir which had been formed by Sardar Mohammad Ibrahim, a young barrister, from Rawalkot in the State of Poonch. He had, however, a heavy task in front of him. He had to arrange for arms, ammunition and equipment from literally non-existing sources and at the same time to organise civil administration in area controlled by this volunteer force. The refugees pouring in from Jammu and adjoining areas were an additional commitment and it is a credit to this ad-hoc Government that they were able to achieve so much with so little at their disposal.

In the meantime V.P. Menon had flown in to Srinagar on October 25, 1947, ostensibly on the invitation of the Maharaja, and returned to Delhi the following day armed with the instrument of accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to India. Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, the Nationalist leader, was released by the Maharaja on the same day and he wished to make him share power with his existing Prime Minister, Mehr Chand Mahajan, but due to Indian insistence he alone was sworn in as the head of the Government on October 31, '947. The pattern emerges gradually, day by day, and the Indian intention of a full and complete control of the State gets clearer with every move. The Maharaja was told to leave Srinagar on the 26th October so that the Indian nominee had full control of the situation. He being a Muslim was of great advantage in this move which then could only be known to the Indian Cabinet and the Governor-General.

The offer of accession was immediately accepted as planned and the Governor General of India, Lord Mountbatten, on behalf of the Indian Government and with the concurrence of his Cabinet announced that this action of India was only of an interim nature and that Sheikh Abdullah's Government was to be replaced and a plebiscite held as soon as peaceful conditions were brought about. On the 27th of October, the day following the accession, Lord Mountbatten categorically said "In consistence with their policy that in the case of any State where the issue of accession has been the subject of dispute, the armies were to take collective action question of association should be decided in accordance with the wishes of the people of the State. It is my Government's wish that as soon as law and order have been restored in Kashmir and her soil cleared of the raiders, the question of State's accession should be settled by a reference to the people."

On the same date, i.e. October 26, 1947, India despatched troops to Srinagar by air. The presence of pre-planning cannot be ruled out, in spite of British and Indian denials, in view of the speed and smoothness with which events moved and operations were mounted.

Mohammad Ali Jinnah, the Governor-General of Pakistan, was then at Lahore. When he heard on October 27, 1947, of the despatch of Indian troops to Srinagar, he at once ordered General Douglas Gracey in Rawalpindi to despatch troops to Srinagar via Jhelum Valley. Gracey, however, felt that even if the troops could have been found, he could not give such orders without the knowledge or sanction of Sir Claude Auchinleck, and he begged to be allowed to delay until Auchinleck could arrive in Lahore for a full discussion.

It has not yet been known under what circumstances the British C.-in-C. in India despatched troops to Kashmir without the knowledge and sanction of the Supreme Commander. Sir Claude Auchinleck and Gracie on October 28, 1947 were able to persuade the Governor-General of Pakistan to withdraw his order. The veiled threat of full scale invasion of Pakistan had been put forward by the two British Generals. It is not known if it had been conveyed to them direct by the Governor-General of India or through the British Government. The Supreme Commander had also mentioned at the meeting that Mountbatten, Nehru, and Hari Singh, the ruler of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, would be coming to Lahore to continue the discussions. Eventually Mountbatten alone came on the first of November. The absence of Nehru was excused under the pretext of diplomatic indisposition. The Indian Cabinet had vetoed it.

On the first of November the meeting of the Joint Defence Council was held but achieved nothing. The Governor-General of Pakistan put forward a plan by which both the Governor-Generals were to issue a joint proclamation calling on all those engaged in fighting to cease fire within forty-eight hours. If the tribesmen did not obey, the two armies were to take collective action against them. Thereafter the administration would be in the hands of the two Governor-Generals, who would accept responsibility for a plebiscite.

The Governor-General of India, Lord Mountbatten, excused himself by pleading lack of powers to make such an announcement and promised to place the proposal before his Cabinet. The answer, as could be expected, was a point blank refusal. Indian had not sent troops merely to recall them within four days.

The Prime Minister of India, instead of adopting a conciliatory attitude, blamed Pakistan for aggression in his broadcast on the 2nd of November. He, however, reiterated what Lord Mountbatten had said and was even more specific in his words when he said, "We are prepared when peace and law and order have been established to have a referendum under international auspices."

Again on November 8, 1947, the Prime Minister of India in a telegram to the Prime Minister of Pakistan declared:

" It will thus be seen that our proposals which we have repeatedly stated are (1) that Government of Pakistan should publicly undertake to do their utmost to compel the raiders to withdraw from Kashmir; (2) that Government of India should repeat their declaration that they will withdraw their troops from Kashmir soil as soon as raiders have withdrawn and law and order are restored; (3) that Governments of India and Pakistan should make a joint request to U.N.O. to undertake a plebiscite in Kashmir at the earliest possible date.

"The above conclusions relate only to Kashmir, but it is essential, in order to restore good relations between the two Dominions that there should be acceptance of principle that, where ruler of a State does not belong to community to which the majority of his subjects belong, and where the State has not acceded to that dominion whose majority community is same as State the question whether State has finally acceded to one or other Dominion should be ascertained by reference to the will of people."

However, this "reference to people" has remained a mirage. Law and order was established in the State several years ago. But that Indian undertaking, subsequently reinforced by an international agreement, that the people of Kashmir shall be allowed to decide the question of accession by means of a free and fair plebiscite conducted under the auspices of the U.N., remains unfulfilled.

As the Indian offensive mounted, over 500,000 Muslims were driven out of Jammu and Kashmir to seek refuge in Pakistan. Her security being thus seriously threatened by the advancing Indian forces, the Government of Pakistan in May 1948 were compelled to move a limited number of troops into the State in order to hold certain defensive positions against the advancing Indian Army.

After hearing both Indian and Pakistani representatives, the Security Council came to the conclusion in April 1948 that the only just, peaceful and democratic solution of this dispute was to determine the accession of the State in accordance with the freely expressed will of the people. The Council appointed a Commission which was able eventually to bring about an agreement beween Pakistan and India on the question of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. This international agreement is embodied in two of the Commission's resolutions dated 13th August 1948 and 5th January 1949.

The main provisions of this international agreement for a plebiscite are:

(i) Cease-fire and demarcation of a cease-fire line;

(ii) Truce agreement, providing inter alia for (a) withdrawal of tribesmen and Pakistan nationals who had entered the State for the purpose of resting the Indian advances; (b) withdrawal of Pakistan troops and the bulk of the Indian Army in a 'synchronised' movement from Jammu and Kashmir, (on account of the difficulties created by India, this dimilitarization has not taken place and the truce agreement has not been signed); (c) a plebiscite to be conducted, under the

> supervision and control of a plebiscite administrator, empowered to determine the final disposal of the remaining forces in the State and vested with all the powers he considers necessary to ensure the freedom and impartiality of the plebiscite

Since then, the U.N. has made a series of efforts to get this promise fulfilled but all in vain. It designated Admiral Nimitz as the Plebiscite Administrator and requested India and Pakistan "to submit to arbitration the difference existing between them." Again in 1950, the Security Council sent its President, Gen. McNaughton of Canada, to seek a solution of the problem. In 1950, Sir Owen Dixon was appointed UN representative to strive for an "expeditious and enduring solution of the dispute." He was followed by Dr. Frank Graham as UN representative. Next, Ambassador Gunnar Jarring was requested to seek an answer to this eaxed question, and then Dr. Graham was asked to try again, but they all failed because India would not agree to their proposals, while Pakistan did.

Meanwhile, inside Kashmir the repression continued unabated against the people yearning to exercise their right of self-determination.

On August 9, 1953, Shiekh Abdullah with his colleagues was put in jail, where he languished till 1963 (with a few days' break in 1958). The people who rose in protest were suppressed with such severity that over 1500 were killed and thousands wounded or imprisoned.

The temporary release of Shiekh Abdullah was the signal for another uprising and more repression.

On December 27, 1963, the Muslims of Kashmir were stunned to hear of the theft of a sacred relic from the shrine in Hazratbal and the burning of a mosque in Kishtwar. The people expressed their suppressed rage against the tormentors in the form of open revolt.

The re-arrest of Sheikh Abdullah and Mirza Afzal Beg on May 8, 1965, on return from pilgrimage to Mecca and a tour of the world, led to widespread strikes, rallies, marches and violent protest.

On June 8, an Action Committee, supported by nine other political and religious organisations, launched a Civil Disobedience Movement.

On August 9, 1965, a secret radio station, calling itself the "Voice of Kashmir", came on the air and announced the formation of a Revolutionary Council in Occupied Kashmir. Two days later, Reuter placed the fighting in the outskirts of Srinagar, about 80 miles away from the cease-fire line.

Some recent events are worthy of note to understand the present happenings.

In May 1965, India occupied some military posts in Kargil sector on the Pakistan side of the cease-fire line. These were vacated on the intervention of the UN Secretary-General, but were again occupied on August 15.

On August 24, Indian forces shelled Awan, a village in West Pakistan, causing a number of deaths.

On August 25, again the Indian troops crossed the cease-fire line and occupied two posts in the Tithwal sector on the Pakistan side. Again on the same day, Indian forces crossed the cease-fire line on the Uri-Poonch sector and seized some Pakistani posts, and on September 1, took Haji Pir Pass.

As foreign Minister of Pakistan reported to the Security Council on September 6: "The acts of agression and grave violations of the cease-fire agreement have created a situation in which the human rights of the people of Jammu and Kashmir as well as the security of Pakistan are equally threatened.

"In response to this grave situation created by the Indian forces, the Azad Kashmir forces backed by the Pakistan army were forced to cross the cease-pre line in the Bhimber sector in exercise of the right of self-defence, for the first time since the cease-fire agreement was reached 17 years ago, after repeated Indian armed attacks and occupation of Azad Kashmir territory by the Indian Army.

"This crossing took place on the 1st of September. India decided to escalate the conflict by mounting air attack against Pakistan forces on the same day, compelling Pakistan Air Force no intervene. On September 4, India carried the escalation a stage further. The Indian Air Force twice violated Pakistan territory in strength escorted by MIG aircraft. And now on Sunday night, India has mounted a treacherous armed attack and this time on West Pakistan."

The story of fighting in Kashmir and the subsequent cease-fire followed by the discussion in the UNO and the Security Council, whose decisions have been continuously ignored, is too well known to be mentioned here. In spite of the Tashkent Declaration between the two countries viz., India and Pakistan, in the presence of such an august personality as Mr. Kosygen, the Prime Minister of U.S.S.R., the relations between India and Pakistan, through the intransigence of the former have not improved but deteriorated and in consequence thereof Kashmir, the paradise on earth, is still groaning under the iron heel of the Indians. With all the resources available to India she has not been able, during all these years, to break the will of the unarmed people of Kashmir and there are no signs that India will ever succeed in winning over the hearts of these simple folks determined to win their freedom.

The denial of the right of self-determination to the people of Kashmir in spite of the solemn pledges of the Indian Government, is one of the greatest contemporary problems of a people's liberation.

Note.—The author has made use of the material contained in an article published in "Muslim News International" in its issue of February 1968 by the famous writer, Brigadier Gulzar Ahmad (Retired).

Muslims in Palestine

Perhaps no decision in history has caused more human suffering than to the Arabs of Palestine who were driven wholesale from their homes and their land to lead a life of misery abroad, which is worse than death. This is in spite of the fact that Arabs and Jews have lived together in peace and harmony for centuries. Wherever the Muslims entered as conquerors, the persecuted Jews welcomed them and the former not only gave them peace and toleration, but in accordance with their own divine laws, treated them as *Ahl-i-Kitab* and as such guaranteed the protection of their life and property and complete freedom of the exercise of their religious beliefs and practices. From the Spanish Inquisition down to the persecutions of Tsarist Russia, thousands of Jews left their respective countries all over Europe and migrated to the Arab Lands where they were given protection and liberal treatment. The best illustration of this peaceful co-existence of Arabs and Jews is to be found in Palestine itself prior to the emergence of Zionism. For when all is said and done, Arabs and Jews are but branches of the same Semitic race, acknowledging Ibrahim as their common ancestor.

The Arab rejects, anti-Semitism as a European or Western aberration; and this very rejection serves to intensify his bitterness over the fact that European persecution of the Jews has been atoned for at the expense of the Arabs of Palestine. Likewise it makes the Arab all the more suspicious that the purpose of the Western powers in creating the state of Israel was more imperialist than humanitarian.

Palestine, under whatever regime it is governed, is as important as Egypt from the point of view of British imperial communications. Strategically, it is the eastern outpost against any potential threat to the Suez Canal; it is the outlet of the oil pipe line from Mousil; it is a halting place on the international air route to India and beyond, and it is a starting point for the desert motor road to Asia. Besides, it is a vital problem for Great Britain and for the whole British Commonwealth with its traditional friendship to both communities i. e., Jews and Muslims.

Jewish colonization was known to the Palestinian Arabs long before the first world war. The Holy places have always held their special significance for many creeds. Colonization was carried on by young Jews from Russia and Rumania. Some agricultural settlements which were self-governing, accounted for some 12,000 of the 85-90,000 Jews in Palestine in 1914; a full half of these lived in Jerusalem for religious reasons; next in importance being the communities in the Holy cities of Safed, Tiberias and Hebron.

There are, however, two fundamental differences between the pre-war and the post-war situation. The first is that the pre-war settlement of Jews in Palestine was dictated by religious motives, whereas post-war Zionist immigration is essentially a political movement. The second is that the war awakened a spirit of nationalism throughout the Near East, and the post-war Arab population is fired with sentiments to which the pre-war generation did not aspire.

In order to understand the back-ground of the creation of the State of Israel in Palestine, one has got to study the story of the muddle which marked Britain and France's dealings with the Arabs during and after World War I. In return for help in the war against the Turks of the Arab armies of the Sherif of Mecca, Hussain, the great grand-father of Jordan's present King, Britain pledged that when the Turkish occupiers were driven out, all Palestine plus Iraq, TransJordan and most of Syria would be free and independent. At the same time, unknown to the Arabs, Britain and France secretly agreed to carve out Syria, Lebanon and Iraq, and parcel out these territories between them as virtual colonies, once the Turks had been defeated. Palestine was to be governed by some unspecified international regime. Yet hardly was the ink dry on this agreement, when the British Govt. began a series of manoeuvres, in league with Dr. Chaim Weizmann's Zionist Federation, designed to gain Jewish support for the Allies in the War against Germany.

The Zionist cause was not furthered by Allies in the early years of the war for the obvious reason that Russia was one of their members, and Zionism was not viewed with favour by the Imperial Russian Government. But in February 1917, the Russian revolution had begun. During that month Sir Mark Sykes entered into close relations with Dr. Chaim Weizmann, a leading Jewish intellectual. As early as 1906 Dr. Weizmann had interested Mr. Balfour in the possibility of a Jewish national home in Palestine, and these two men were the leading figures in the negotiations between the Zionist Organisation and the British Government which were carried on throughout the summer of 1917.

These negotiations, which had the full approval of the United States Government, culminated on Nov. 2, 1917 in the so-called Balfour Declaration, which was in point of fact a letter written by Mr. Balfour to Lord Rothschild which contained the following statement :

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish People, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish Communities in Palestine or the rights and political status enjoyed by the Jews in any other country."

The French Govt. expressed its approval of the scheme on Feb. 14, 1918 ; the Italian Govt. also approved it, and the sentiment which prompted it received the warm support of public opinion in the United States. The suggestion is often heard that the declaration was to induce the rich American Jews to use their influence to make the United States Government enter the war.

Meanwhile Arab hopes were raised by a joint Anglo-French declaration of Nov. 7, 1918 which defined the war aims of the Allies in the East and promised "administrations deriving their authority from the initiative and free choice of the indigenous populations, in Syria and Mesopotamia." This was felt among" Arabs to supersede or at least to qualify the Sykes-Picot agreement.

It is often pointed out that this declaration omits Palestine; to this the reply of the Palestinian Arabs is that they did not take it as such; the main reasons which they give for the interpretation being that they did not use the name Palestine, and knew the whole region as Syria, and that the declaration was distributed throughout the whole of Greater Syria, i. e. (including what is now Palestine) and Mesopotamia.

Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations established the mandates system, the guiding principle of which is that 'the well-being and development of the inhabitants of certain ex-enemy colonies and territories shall be a sacred trust for civilization under the tutelage of a mandatory on behalf of the League. President Wilson attempted to fulfil the clause in the Covenant which lays down that "the wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the mandatory" by securing the appointment of an Allied commission to ascertain their wishes. When the British and French failed to fall in with his plan, he sent a private American commission under H. C. King and C. R. Crane which received petitions and interviewed delegations all over Palestine and Syria in June-July 1919.

The chief points in the report affecting Palestine were: i. Strong sentiment favourable to complete independence for a united Syria (including Palestine) but if supervision was necessary then the U. S. Was preferred than Britain; (ii) Strong opposition to the Zionist proposal was also indicated. But the King-Crane report was n published until 1922 and was in any case unofficial.

The Zionist Organisation was more specific:

"We ask that Britian shall act as Mandatory of the League of Nations for Palestine. The selection of Britain as Mandatory is

---

1. Temperely, History of the peace Conference. (Vol. VI, p, 14).

urged on the ground that this is the wish of the Jews of the World and the League of Nations in selecting a Mandatory will follow, a far as possible, the popular wish of the people concerned."

However, the Supreme Council, sitting at San Remo, allocated the Mandate to Great Britain on April 25, 1920, adding a rider to the effect that the Mandatory Power should responsible for giving effect to the Balfour Declaration.

The final draft was tentatively confirmed by the League Council on July 22, 1922. But it was felt undesirable to promulgate it in advance of the Frandeh Mandate for Syria. The final entry into force of the two Mandates did not take place until Sept. 29, 1923.

The terms of the Mandate endeavoured to fulfil the promises made . Article 2. The Mandatory shall be responsible for placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish national home, as laid down in the preamble, and the development of self governing institutions, and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race and religion.

The Balfour Declaration to the Jews was further implemented by the promise of a recognised Jewish Agency to advise the Administration on the establishment of the national home, and by undertaking to facilitate immigration and encourage close settlement of Jews on the land, subject to the rights and position of other sections of the population. The Mandatory also promised the encouragement of local autonomy and undertook all responsibility with respect to rights of access to the Holy Place.

The only complication arising out of the wartime promises and the Mandate seemed to be the fact that the Mandatory differed from the Palestinian Arabs as to the meaning of the McMahon undertaking and that many Arabs therefore denied the validity of Mandate. Apart from this, there appears to have been every hope that the Mandatory would implement its triple promise under the Mandate : namely to safeguard Arabs rights, to provide a national home for the Jews, and to secure for the joint community self-government.

Within 26 years, British Mandate completely fulfilled what Britain had promised in the Balfour Declaration. Its very start was enough to disclose the destination : Herbert Samuel, the Zionist leader and the man who suggested the foundation of the Jewish State in Palestine, was appointed as first High Commissioner for Palestine. Doors were opened for Jewish immigration so much so that the number of Jews was boosted from fifty thousand in 1917 to around 700 thousand in 1947, which is fourteen-fold of the original figure. Land taxation laws were laid down in such a manner as to enable wealthy Jews to seize large areas of land in addition to half a million dunums[1] donated by the mandatory power to Jewish institutions. The electricity concession was granted to a Jew (Rothenberg). The concession to exploit the Dead Sea, which has been estimated by experts at 14 billion sterlings, was also granted to two Jews. Herbert Samuel later on became Chairman of the Board of the Dead Sea Company. The Concession granted the company vast areas of land on the shores of the Dead Sea. The Mandatory power gave the company 64 thousand dunums on a nominal lease. Thus the two sources of wealth were given to the Jews : The Electric Power and the sources of Chemical Industry. The government also undertook protection of Jewish industries by imposing customs duties on competitive imported goods and by lowering duties on raw materials required by these industries.

The Jews were not satisfied with these privileges. They knew well that by turning Palestine into a Jewish State, they were undertaking an aggression which required more than increase in immigration and cementing of economic control. Therefore, the Jewish Agency recognised by the Mandate Charter, created a military power attached to it, called Haganah. It established a department for recruiting and training people capable of carrying arms, of both sexes. The Agency then succeeded in 1944 in persuading the British Government through Mr. Churchill, who openly declared that he was proud of being a Zionist, to create a Jewish brigade that would fight by the side of the Allies. It was decided that the Brigade would have its commander, officers, soldiers, rabbis, flag and even cooking arrangements, all Jews.

---

[1] (A dunum is equal to 1,000 square metres).

Armed bands attached to the Jewish Agency became numerous in Palestine itself. Big funds were raised for the purchase of arms ; and even stealing of arms from the British Army was authorised. Zionists continued purchase of arms and stored them in underground stores in their settlements, which were built according to a premeditated military plan as regards their structure and distribution.

It was natural that the Arabs of Palestine should revolt against the Balfour Declaration and the Mandate Rule. Their revolts were staged from 1920 till 1939. Theirs was a very hard battle, facing the might of the mandatory rule which had been imposed to realise the objectives of Zionism, and the armed Zionist bands who considered themselves the de jure rulers of Palestine. People who were against the terrorist policy of these bands, had to pay the price with their lives. This was done to several Arabs and some of the British officers who could not but listen to the voice of conscience after being confronted with facts. Among them was Lord Moyne, British Minister of State, who was shot dead by the Stern gang in Egypt on November 6, 1944. A good number of British soldiers and officers were also killed in strange circumstances. Others were kidnapped and whipped and left hanging from trees. Britain took only trivial and insignificant measures to face these insults and sacrifices, while it gave vent to its wrath over the heads of the tens of thousands of Arabs who never succumbed or surrendered to the British Zionist conspiracy that aimed at usurping their land, homes and belongings. Death penalty awaited every Arab who had a single cartridge in his possession. To illustrate this, the Minister of colonies, Mr. Jones, declared in the House of Commons that British Military Tribunals sentenced 148 Arabs to death for possessing arms or ammunition.

Besides this method of violence and injustice, Britain used to resort to another method whenever Arab resistance mounted. That was the method of issuing conciliatory statements and investigation committees, whose number exceeded twenty, with reports all in favour of the Arabs. But neither the government of Britain nor the mandatory rule that had to abide by the dictates of its high policy ever respected a single report.

On 13th November, 1945, Mr. Bevin, British Minister for Foreign Affairs, made in the House of Commons his historic statement where he brought to light the contradiction implied in Britain's obligations towards the Jewish claim and their historical right as embodied in the Balfour Declaration, and the rights of the Arabs who had inhabited the country for more than a thousand years. He stressed the gravity of the Palestine conflict between Zionists and their strong supporters and the Palestine Arabs backed by all other Arab countries and the whole Islamic world. He then urged the U. S. A. to shoulder the burden of responsibility with Britain. The statement reflected the critical position of Britain after 23 years of serving Zionism and betraying the Arabs, and its failure to put the Balfour promise into effect against the will of the original inhabitants. The U. S. A. became entangled and stepped forward to share in the tragedy in its worst stages. Mr. Truman hurriedly moved to act under the great influence of Zionism. An Anglo-American Committee was set up with most of its member pro-Zionist. The Arabs boycotted the committee, which visited Palestine and the Arab States and laid down its report, which may be considered a continuation of the Balfour Declaration. The Committee, however, stated that the Arabs in all the Arab states unanimously declared their enmity to Zionism, and the representatives of Christian Churches in these countries expressed their solidarity with the Muslims by asking for an independent Arab State.

On 6th Feb. 1947, Mr. Bevin announced that the problem was very complicated and should be referred to the United Nations. This, of course, followed his failure to subject the Arabs to various deceptive proposals which were all rejected. Again the U. N. decided to send an investigation committee. U. S. A., British and French delegates refused to include a declaration of Palestine independence among the duties of the committee. Officially the Arabs boycotted the committee, yet it was cordially received by them in all places. The Jews, to assert themselves, received the committee with a campaign of terror, destruction and assassination.

The committee's decision contained two proposals which in practice amounted to partition and recognised the de-facto situation created by the British Mandate. The Arabs in Palestine and the Arab states rebelled against the committee's decision and the Arab League announced in the name of its peoples the rejection of any proposal based on partition and usurpation of any part of Palestine by foreigners brought into the country against the will of its inhabitants:

On the 29 Nov. 1947 the U. N. decided on partition after manoeuvres in which the big Powers, under pressure of international Zionism, played a major role. The resolution was met with anger and strikes all over the Arab and Islamic world. On 8th December, 1947, Arab Premiers issued a communique revealing the injustice implied in the U. N. resolution.

Bloody fights started between the Arabs and the Jews because of the proposed partition of Palestine. In spite of the Jewish planning and hoarding of arms, the Arabs were able to win the first round of the battle. They lost twenty thousand men, and the strong resistance they showed compelled the U. S. A. delegate to announce that their government had withdrawn its support to the partition proposal.

Then the British started their treacherous withdrawal, handing over most of the cities to the Jews. They started to evacuate Jewish areas to enable the Jews to assume control. They gave them the aerodromes and military utilities, while they occupied the Arab Zoan from being supplied by the neighbouring Arab countries until the Jews could be in a position to seize their national homeland in fulfilment of the Balfour Declaration.

The state of Israel had been born and it now only remained for the Zionists to make sure that when it came into being on May 15, 1948, with the final departure of the British army, it should be, as Weizmann had prclaimed, "as Jewish as Britain is British." So they set to work to persuade the Arabs of Jaffa, Tiemerias and other towns and areas, which the U.N. allotted to the Jewish State that they whould be well advised to leave and join their brothers in the Arab Areas of the partition. In this task the Jewish terrorist groups such as the Stern Gang and the Irgun Svei Leumi were brought in when more gentle methods of persuasion failed. At Deir Yassin near Jerusalem 250 Arab villagers, including pregnant women and young girls, were butchered by Zionist terrorists and their bodies mutilated.

These ruthless measures had the desired effect. Between the U.N. vote for Partition in November 1947 and the final British evacuation in the following May, over 300,000 Arabs had left their homes and farms in the areas of Palestine that were allocated to the Jews and had become refugees. This fact alone was in the eyes of Arab brothers beyond the borders of Palestine sufficient reason to launch their ill-fated war against the infant Israeli state as soon as the last British soldier and withdrawn.

But the reinstatement of this first instalment of the Palestine Arab refugees was not the only reason which impelled Egypt, Transjordan, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq to turn their armies against Israel. For the Arab world saw in the creation of this alien western state in their midst far more than the instrument whereby over 300,000 of their fellows had been rendered homeless.

Thus it was without any proper co-ordination of military planning and without adequate appreciation of the fanatical resistance which their opponents were to show, the Arab armies flung themselves upon Israel in May 1948. For a brief moment at the start of the war, the Arabs gained the upper hand. The Western Powers then called for a truce which was accepted by both sides. But when the fighting was resumed by the Israelis, the Arabs were soon to discover that their opponents had made good use of the interval to stock up with modern weapons from the Soviet Block (then fervent supporter of the State of Israel), whereas they had been denied any such provision by the West. The results of this ill-conceived war are well-known. The Arabs of Palestine were worse off than ever. They lost about half of the area allotted to them under the U.N. partition scheme and were left with an area roughly 100 miles long and 40 miles wide which we know today as the 'West Bank', comprising ihe Old City of Jerusalem, the Judaean Hills and the Jordan valley. This area, being totally unviable as an independent state, was attached to Transjordan, which became the Kingdom of Jordan.

Worst of all, a further 450,000 Palestine Arabs had been evicted from their homes by their Israeli conquerors to raise the total refugee population to over three quarters of a million—now swollen to well over 1,300,000 as a result of the recent war as well as natural increases.

Israel was promptly requested by the U.N. General Assembly to repatriate and compensate the Arab refugees—indeed her very admission as a member of the U.N. was linked with her undertaking to fulfil this request. But although the Assembly has re-affirmed its resolution every year since 1939, Israel has steadfastly refused to comply with it, pleading that the repatriation of so large a number of disgruntled Arabs would create an intolerable security problem within her borders. All that she has once offered to negotiate is the return of a maximum of 150,00 of the existing refugee population, which the Arabs rejected as totally inadequate recompense.

For this very reason the Arabs have refused to negotiate any formal peace settlement with the State of Israel or in any way recognise the 1949 armistice borders as her legal or definite frontiers. And proclaiming that in absence of a peace treaty a state of war still exists between themselves and Israel, the Arab States have claimed belligerent rights in imposing an economic blockade and, in the case of Egypt, denying passage to Israeli ships through the Suez Canal in accordance with her rights under Article X of the Constantinople Convention. But apart from these political and economic sanctions and marauding by Arab irregulars inside Israel's borders, the Arab states since 1949 have confined themselves to waging a war of words, often provocative and ill chosen mainly by radio, and in speeches at the United Nations.

Nevertheless the humiliation of their defeat bit deeply into Arab emotions and aggravated suspicions of Western connivance. Nowhere did these emotions run higher than among the young army officers, especially of Egypt and Syria, who blamed the West for refusing to supply them with arms, while Israel was buying equipment from Russian sources, and felt, not without justification, that they had been let down by corrupt rulers who ruled their lands and had been maintained and, in some cases, actually installed in office by British or French pro-consuls. A New wave of Arab nationalism, with the army as its spearhead and independence as its battle-cry, began to spread across the Arab world. But the most significant revolution occurred in Egypt when in 1952 a group of young officers led by Gamal Abdel Nasser with General Naguib as their figurehead, ousted King Farouk, proclaimed a republic, and demanded the withdrawal of the 80,000 strong British Garrison in the Suez Canal base. Soon afterwards nationalist movements in French North Africa followed suit. Tunisia and Morocco wrested their independence from a reluctant France, and in 1954 in Algeria a bloody struggle against the French occupation was launched, which was to last for the next seven years.

Misinterpreting these nationalist movements as Communist inspired conspiracies to substitute Russian for Western influence in the Middle East, the Western Powers reacted by seeking to reinforce their position in countries like Jordan and Iraq where the old monarchial regimes still held sway and where military agreements entitled them to maintain troops, air squadrons and bases. But it was a losing battle. For one thing, Egypt had by 1956 set the pattern for the future by securing the final withdrawal of British forces; but more important than that the nationalists were able to counter any Western argument about the need for Western bases as a protection for the Arabs with the emotive accusation that it was the British and their Western henchmen who had persistently sold the Arabs down the river ever since 1917. Far from protecting the Arabs, the nationalists' argument ran, the West was protecting its own interests (e.g. oil) and endangering the Arabs by dragging them into its quarrels with the Soviet block. And, it concluded, the West was using two elements to further these aims—the ancient regimes of men such as Nuri es-Said in Iraq, even of Camille Chamoun in Lebanon, and that hated Zionist creature of Western perfidy, the State of Israel.

The climax of the mounting campaign of suspicion and counter-suspicion came in July 1956 when, in an act of defiance President Nasser nationalised the Suez Canal Company. What followed is too well-known to require repetition. But one thing cannot be emphasised too strongly. By acting as they did in collusion with Israel, Britain and France confirmed the deepest suspicions of every Arab nationalist that Israel had been created as a Western stalking horse to further whatever designs and enforce whatever demands the West might have against the Arab world. Here was proof positive that when Britain and France could no longer rely on their Arab puppets to do their bidding, they would turn to Israel to create the necessary pretext for them to move in and impose their will. And whatever else the Anglo-French-Israeli invasion of Egypt in 1956 might have done, it certainly spelled the beginning of the end of any remaining British influence in the Arab world, and in particular of those regimes still clinging to the British connexion and still permitting British bases on their territory. Jordan's King Hussein promptly tore up his treaty with Britain and less than two years later Nuri el-Said and the King of Iraq paid with their lives for their British associations, Chamoun was ousted in Lebanon and in due course the Arab revolution was to spread to the very tip of the Arabian peninsula engulfing Yemen and Britain's last toe-hold in the Arab world—Aden. Russian influence supplanted British as one by one the new Arab republics turned to the Soviet Union for arms and aid.

Now the Arabs are faced—and this time without that measure of world opinion that supported them in 1956—with an Israeli occupation of the whole of Palestine, plus the Syrian Heights and the Sinai peninsula, with the Suez Canal blocked and an enemy force encamped upon its eastern bank. And once more the toll of suffering for the Palestine Arabs has increased with 175,000 of the West Bank population now refugees on the East Bank of the Jordan, of whom not more than 13,000 could return before the way was finally closed against them by the Israeli occupation authorities, while the exodus continues. Once again, too, the facile cry goes up from the Israeli side that all the Arabs have to do is to recognise and accept the State of Israel for there to be everlasting peace in the area. To which the Arabs reply : why should we recognise an alien state which has twice in 11 years attacked us and seized our land, a state whose very existence was from the outset established at the expense of the Arabs of Palestine whose forefathers had continuously owned and farmed the land of Palestine for 1300 years? Why should we, who gave asylum to European Jewry down the centuries, be made to atone for Europe's conscience and Europe's cruelties to the Jews? You, the Israelis, ask for peaceful coexistence with the Arabs, but what you mean is that the Arabs should surrender unconditionally, accepting the status quo, renouncing their rights to repatriation and resettlement and agreeing, as your General Dayan recently proposed for the West Bank, to live under Israeli military rule in a system of apartheid as second class citizens like the 2,50,000 Arabs left in Israel have endured since 1949. That we cannot accept, and if that is all you have to offer, we can only continue to resist you in the name of our dispossessed brothers of Palestine; and even if it takes a hundred or more years, as it did with the Crusaders, we shall overcome you in the end. For like the Crusaders you were established here by alien powers and we shall never accept such alien influences or bow to alien designs against us.

As the main theme of this chapter is to show the cruel treatment meted out to Muslims under the rule of the Jews and the atrocities perpetrated on them, it is worth while to give some account of the atrocities given by impartial European writers] particularly by Micheal Adams, Middle East correspondent of the 'Guardian' from 1956 till 1960, who is a journalist with an extensive knowledge of the area. He writes in the Manchester Guardian, 26 Jan. 1968, under the caption, "Hardships of Gaza Strip Refugees":

"In the measures it is now taking against the civilian Arab population in the Gaza Strip, the Israeli army of occupation is disregarding the provisions of the 1949 Geneva Convention for the protection of civilians in time of war.

"In response to a series of minor incidents, in the past three weeks, the Israeli army has imposed collective punishments on the population (mainly refugees from Palestine) regardless of age and sex. They include curfews lasting several days during which no proper provision is made for the distribution of food and water, arbitrary arrests, and the random demolition of houses and property belonging to citizens in no way connected with incidents." When he was leavihg Gaza he said, "Three refugee camps housing 100,000

Seminar Library
Department of Islamic Hist
Univ

Palestine refugees were under day and night curfew, and there was sporadic shooting in the streets of Gaza city which served no apparent purpose beyond the intimidation of the civilian population. Shati (Beach) camp on the outskirts of Gaza suffered a similar fate a fortnight ago for five days and nights. For the first 28 hours no one was allowed on any pretext to leave his house —which in refugee camps means one or two small rooms without a latrine. On the second day the curfew was lifted for an hour at UNRWA's urging to allow refugees to collect water. The refugees were still forbidden to leave camp and no distribution of food was allowed, not many managed to get water since with the limited number of water points, supplied by hand pump, it takes time to serve the camp's population of 35,000. During the break all men betwen 16 and 60 were ordered on to the compound on the seashore where they were held for seven hours during one of the winter's severest storms while Israel guards repeatedly fired with small arms over their heads.

"This form of collective punishment is characteristic of the present series of curfews; at Jabaliyeh camp the male population was held on a stretch of marshy ground for 25 hours without food or water. During much of the time at Shati camp there was heavy rain and four days passed before the Israelis allowed UNRWA to distribute food, and even then the curfew was reimposed before the distribution was completed. Relief workers found many of the women in the camp, particularly those with small children, in a state of near hysteria. These hardships are being imposed under various vain pretexts; but most of the non Arab, non Jewish population of Gaza is unconvinced that there is any serious resistance movement in operation in the area; they find it hard to believe that one of the few serious incidents—where a bomb in Gaza market injured 35 Arabs—could knowingly have been caused by an Arab. They believe that the only danger to security in Gaza comes from the present determined and often brutal attempt by the Israeli Army to 'persuade' the Arab refugees to leave the Gaza Strip, thus opening the way to its annexation by Israel". He goes on so say that "The Germans never treated him as harshly when he was a prisoner of war for a period of four years in Germany as the Israelis are treating the Arabs of Gaza Strip, the majority of whom are women and children."

Writing again in the Guardian, under the caption "The Bull Dozers the Symbol of Israeli Tyranny", on Monday, March 4, 1968, he says, "for more than a month now, Israeli Bulldozers have been at work on Mount Scopus, clearing the ground for a housing development on the open hill-side overlooking interests of all its citizens. In expropriating 800 acres of land here in the face of bitter protests from the Arab commuuity, the Israelis have embarked upon their most far reaching defiance of the United Nations, which last year called on them to desist from any action which would alter the status of the Arab city of Jerusalem. It is odd, but not inappropriate, that the bulldozer should have become the symbol of Israel's mastery of the Holy City. Before going to war in June 1967, Israel assured the world through its Prime Minister Mr. Eshkol, that she had no design on 'even one foot' of Arab land; but within a week of the end of the fighting the bulldozers were at work in the Old City and before the end of June 1967, they had made nearly 4,000 Arabs homeless.

"The methods of harrassment of the Arabs on the part of the Israeli Govt. have reached such a pass that an Arab inhabitant of Jerusalem whose ancestors may have lived here for a thousand years before any of the present rulers of Israel stepped foot in Palestine is now made aware at every turn of the presence of an alien authority which has power to raise his taxes, to expropriate his land, to bulldoze his house out of existence, to arrest him, to expel him—all this while denying him recourse of any kind to any authority which can lift a finger to help him.

"Such an Arab has no longer even any clearly established nationality. He must carry an identity card which expressly states that 'this certificate does not establish the right to enter Israel'. He has no Israeli passport, yet if he uses his Jordanian passport to travel to any other country he cannot return to Jerusalem. He is not represented in the municipal council which has assumed control of the city's affairs, nor in the Parliament of the country which now seeks to claim his allegiance."

Malcom Muggeridge, in a recent article, wrote of feeling "abnormally horrified to see in Jerusalm two Arabs, one of them a youth, being arrested, beaten up and then, with black bags over their backs driven away at top speed in a jeep. The effect is to 'persuade the victims and anyone who knows what has happened to them that safety lies on the far side of the Jordan River in a refugee camp.' "

Is there then no solution, no way of escape from the impasse into which Israel's defiance of the U. N has plunged Jerusalem? To my mind, at present there seems to be no solution of Muslims in Palestine as Israel is not only determined to keep in its possesssion all the conquered Arab Land and to eliminate all Muslim population either through destruction or emigration; but she has got the ambition to extend her boundaries throughout the Middle East. In order to prove my contention, it will be worth while to recall here the decision of the Zionist Congress adopted in 1897 which says that the country should be able to accommodate the 15 million Jews scattered all over the world. In 1948, Ben Gurion, Premier of Israel addressed a message to the Jews while the U.N. was holding one of its sessions. He said that his final objective is to bring all Jews to Israel. The man himself declared that the Jews had adopted war as a basis and fundamental means for the realization of their dream. In a ceremony on the occassion of the graduation of Jewish cadets in March 1949, he said that he would make war a 'Jewish profession' until all the country was liberared and until the Jewish people came back to their father-land which extends from the Eupharates in the East to the Nile in the West. The motto of Jewish Parliament is: "Thy boundaries, Israel, are from the Euphrates to the Nile. Israels' ambitions go far beyond what has been accomplished so far. After the First World War, a secret map of the state of Israel was found in a Rothschild safe in Frankfurt. The map covers Palestine, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq (excluding its northern part, the Sinai Peninsula, the Nile Delta and the Holy City of Mecca.

The U.N. possesses no sanctioning authority to enforce their resolutions upon defiant countries like India, Rhodesia and Palestine; and as such the Muslims should pin their hopes on the resolutions of U.N. It is a fact that Israel has conquered the Arab Lands through force and they can only be ejected through force and that is not possible unless collective action is taken by all the Muslim States including Arab kingdoms. In the absence of any such action, the Arabs will not only lose their conquered lands but will also see the annihilation or eviction of their brethren from those places which are at present under the jurisdiction of Israel.

Seminar Library
Department of Islamic History
University of Karachi.

Jamiyat-ul-Falah Publications

		Paper Bound	Plastic Cover
1.	CALIPHATE AND SULTANATE IN MEDIEVAL PERSIA by Dr. Amir Hasan Siddiqi, B.A., LL.B. (Alig.), B. A. (Hons.), Ph. D. (London).	Rs. 10.00	Rs. 12.00
2.	(خلافت و سلطنت) Urdu Translation of the above by Mr. Sibtain Ahmad.	Rs. 5.00	Rs. 7.00
3.	THE ORIGINS & DEVELOPMENT OF MUSLIM INSTITUTIONS by Dr. Amir Hasan Siddiqi.	Rs. 9.00	Rs. 11.00
4.	(مسلم تنصیبات) Urdu Translation of the above by Mr. Hasan Riaz.	Rs. 5.00	Rs. 7.00
5.	STUDIES IN ISLAMIC HISTORY by Dr. Amir Hasan Siddiqi	Rs. 8.00	Rs. 10.00
6.	(اسلامی تاریخ) Urdu Translation of the above by Mr. Hasan Riaz.	Rs. 6.00	Rs. 7.00
7.	HEROES OF ISLAM, PART I by Dr. Amir Hasan Siddiqi.	Rs. 7.50	Rs. 9.50
8.	[illegible]	Rs. 5.00	Rs. 7.00
		Rs. 6.00	Rs. 8.00
		Rs. 7.00	Rs. 9.00
		Rs. 7.00	Rs. 9.00
		Rs. 3.00	Rs. 5.00
		Rs. 4.00	Rs. 6.00
		Rs. 7.00	Rs. 9.00
		Rs. 3.00	Rs. 5.00
		Rs. 2.75	Rs. 4.00
		Rs. 6.00	Rs. 8.00
		Rs. 5.00	Rs. 7.00
		Rs. 3.00	
		Re. 1.00	
		Rs. 7.50	

SEMINAR LIBRARY
Department of Islamic History
University of Karachi

Book can be retained for the period permited by the rules.

Rs.5/= per day for each overdue books shall be charged.

No books shall be issued to a defaulting borrower, until he/she has returned the books already with him/her.

Book lost, defaced or damaged shall have to be replaced or paid for by the borrowers.

OFFICE

20, off Frere Road, S ddar, Karachi.

VOICE OF ISLAM

This monthly organ of the Jamiyatul Falah, founded in 1952, is the premier English monthly from Pakistan on Islamic subjects. This magazine seeks to give an honest presentation of the message and ideology of Islam, the eternal source of light and guidance for humanity. It also seeks to explain the role of Islam in the history of mankind. But above all, it seeks to explain the claims of Islam upon ourselves today in the second half of the twentieth century.

The magazine presents solid and thought-provoking articles on Islamic subjects by some of the best scholars.

Editor: **Rafiq Khawar**, M.A., LL.B.

Annual Subscription .

India and Pakistan	...	Rs. 10/-
Other countries		
In sterling pounds	...	£ 1.10
In dollars (U.S. or Canada)	...	$ 5.00

Printed at Technical Printers, Karachi-1.